This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

ICER.

Review.

VOL. XLI.

ARY—JUNE.

N:

& C. MOZLEY,

ROW;

ADWAY, NEW YORK.

THE

CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER.

A

Quarterly Review.

VOL. XLI.

JANUARY—JUNE.

LONDON:
PUBLISHED BY J. & C. MOZLEY,
6, PATERNOSTER ROW;
AND D. APPLETON & CO. 348, BROADWAY, NEW YORK.

1861.

LONDON:
PRINTED BY R. CLAY, SON, AND TAYLOR,
BREAD STREET HILL.

THE

CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER.

JANUARY, 1861.

ART. I.—*Life and Epistles of S. Paul.* By the Rev. W. J. CONYBEARE and the Rev. J. S. HOWSON. London: Longman & Co. 1858.

WE are glad that a recent edition of Messrs. Conybeare and Howson's volumes enables us to give the work that notice which we ought in truth long since to have extended to it. We are indebted to the laborious and painstaking editors, one of whom has lately been lost to literature, for a most valuable and interesting work on the life and writings of the great Apostle of the Gentiles.

Instead of contenting themselves, as many previous historians have done, with giving a bare narrative of the Apostle's life and actions, as they are to be gathered from the Epistles and the Book of the Acts, Messrs. Conybeare and Howson have carefully sought for and availed themselves of all extraneous sources of information calculated to elucidate or illustrate their main subject.

Thus, from what is known of the domestic habits of the Jews of S. Paul's time, their early training, and subsequent manner of life, they endeavour to place before us the picture of the Apostle as a child; as he grew into manhood; and as his mind and habits of thought were formed and moulded previously to his conversion. They seek, from the moral and religious condition of heathen cities and peoples in his days, to know and understand him as a missionary teacher of the Gospel. The state of the Roman Empire, its laws, customs, and privileges, are made to assist us in the realization of his position, and to exhibit him to our mental gaze, now as speaking and acting with secular authority: now as in chains and pleading for his freedom. The sects, the heresies, the idolatries, and those monstrous perversions of religion which were in existence even then, and which marked the early centuries of the Church, are discussed wherever the knowledge of their tenets is necessary to the elucidation of a difficult text or an obscure allusion;

155198

and lastly, even mechanical aids, in the shape of maps, plans, and engravings, are not forgotten; and although all the separate lines are not perhaps treated with equal ability and success—and we have not seldom to complain of the authors' verbiage and diffuseness, which is often carried on into something little better than mere declamation, and to wish that they had exhibited more of compression and vigour of style, and had been more sparing in their attempts to force on the reader's attention observations and reflections that would better have been left to his own mind—there is in truth much for which readers of every class have to thank them, and from which few, if any, can fail to gain information and improvement.

As it is clearly impossible in our limited space to follow the authors in each of their separate lines of illustration, we must content ourselves with the selection of a few points which appear to us of more interest or importance than the rest. The first subject on which we will offer a few remarks is our authors' scheme of chronology of the Apostle's life and acts: for whilst we precisely agree with them in the dates they affix to S. Paul's actions, and the events of his life, *after* the Council of Jerusalem, we think that they are in error in some of those which they adopt of particular occurrences *before* that period.

And surely there are few subjects more important in its results, and therefore more worthy of careful study, than this 'eye of history,' as chronology has been termed. No man, we venture to affirm, can ever hope to make a good historical scholar, who is content with slovenly or hap-hazard chronology. Calculation helps to make the mind accurate; and although the study of 'dates' is given up or slurred over by many, because it is troublesome, and requires much patience and perseverance, we should remember that if all had shrunk from this task, there would now be little or no accurate historical knowledge to be obtained; and the gain to us of the unwearied diligence and research of such men as Baronius, Pagi, Pearson, and others, shows the good that may be done by careful labour in this department of history. For our knowledge of history is necessarily based in a great degree on chronology; and if we have no accurate idea of that of the life and acts of S. Paul, the subsequent history of the Church will be to us for a considerable period little else than a maze and a perplexity.

In the chronology of S. Paul's life, as far as it is related by S. Luke in the Acts, there is (as has been observed before) but one date the certainty of which is known: consequently from this date we must calculate both backwards and forwards. It is the death of Herod Agrippa I. We know, and the knowledge is our guide throughout almost the whole of S. Paul's life,

that this event happened A.D. 44; for Josephus tells us, both in the Antiquities and in the Wars of the Jews, that Herod died in the seventh year of his reign. 'He reigned four years under 'Caius Cæsar (Caligula),' and he reigned besides these 'three years under Claudius.' (Antiq. XIX. chap. viii. § 2, Whiston's translation; and Bell. Jud. II. chap. xi. § 6.) And as he began to reign nearly at the same time as Caligula, who succeeded to the throne in A.D. 37, the seventh year of his reign would fall in A.D. 44. From this date we are enabled, with the Biblical account before us of what was done by S. Paul between his conversion and Herod's death, to trace back with tolerable accuracy the year of the former event; to arrange the different occurrences that took place between them; and thus to gain a generally correct idea of the space of time that they must have occupied. Looking onwards, we calculate from the same period to the Council of Jerusalem. The exact year indeed of this Council is unknown; but, by the same process, *i.e.* by taking the account of what was done by the Apostle between the death of Herod and its being called together, we can fix with sufficient exactness its proximate date, being careful, however, to allow a sufficient period for the events which are known to have happened between the Council and the Apostle's first visit to Rome, and continuing the history from that time to its close in his martyrdom.

To begin, then, with the first period, and calculate back from A.D. 44 to the year of the conversion. The *ordo rerum*, as given in the Book of Acts, and in the 1st and 2d chapters of Galatians, is as follows:—

The conversion. Acts ix.

His retirement to Arabia, Gal. i. 16, 17: immediately (εὐθέως:) which would allow of no considerable period, a few weeks at most, or more probably days, being spent at Damascus.

His return to Damascus, Acts ix. 22, compared with Gal. i. 17. Three years therefore, *i.e.* one whole year and parts of two others, elapsed either between verses 19 and 20,or 22 and 23 of the ninth of Acts.

Jerusalem, to S. Peter and the Apostles, Acts ix. 26; Gal. i. 18; the first visit after his conversion.

Syria and Cilicia, Gal. i. 21; which of course are the Cæsarea and Tarsus of Acts ix. 30.

Antioch, one whole year, Act xi. 26.

Jerusalem, with contributions; Acts xi. 30, during his stay at which Herod Agrippa died, A.D. 44; Acts xii. 23.

Now, between the conversion and the death of Herod there are three years specified; viz. those in Arabia, which were probably three years of Jewish computation, that is, as we have

said above, one whole year and parts of two others, and one at Antioch. All that remains to be accounted for is the visit to Cæsarea and Tarsus (Acts ix. 30), mentioned by the Apostle in Gal. i. 21, as the regions of Syria and Cilicia. The Church at Jerusalem, having heard of what had been done at Antioch, sent Barnabas thither, who, when he had stayed there long enough to become acquainted with the facts of the case, went to Tarsus for Saul. These journeys, and the stay of Barnabas at Antioch, cannot be considered to have occupied less than a year; and as we do not know how long a period elapsed between the departure of Saul from Jerusalem on his way to Cæsarea and Tarsus, and the journey of Barnabas to Antioch, we may allow somewhat more.

It appears clear, however, both from the nature of the case and from the order of the inspired history, that the conversion of Antioch, caused by those who were scattered abroad on the martyrdom of Stephen, was going on while Saul was in Arabia, and that the news of it did not reach Jerusalem till after his return. This is a matter of some importance, because, though the conversion of such a city as Antioch might possibly have taken up the time of Saul's stay in Arabia, it could hardly have required double that period; and if so, there cannot be allowed in the ninth of Acts, what Paley and some others have contended for, *two* periods of three years: the former of Saul's stay in Arabia; the latter, of his subsequent visit to Damascus.

We have, then, the three Jewish years—(in fact, *two complete* years)—in Arabia: the two visits to Damascus occupying probably together a few months, at most a year, fifteen days with S. Paul at Jerusalem, if those days comprise the whole period spent by the Apostle in the city: a year at Tarsus, and another at Antioch, at the end of which Barnabas and Saul went to Jerusalem, during whose stay at that place, as is evident from the text, Acts xi. 29, 30; xii. 23, Herod Agrippa died. This computation, which appears to be on the surface of the text, reduces the conversion to the year 40, and although made, we may mention, independently, arrives at the same result as that of Wieseler.

But on the other hand, against the conclusion which fixes the above year as that of the conversion, we have to take into consideration a very material fact: that the early Fathers are almost unanimous in asserting that the conversion took place in the same year as the Crucifixion, *i.e.* in the course of the same twelve months: a conclusion which also appears to be in close harmony with the sacred text, the narrative of which, as contained in the first eight chapters, seems to be strictly continuous. If so, the notion that the period here supposed, one of six or seven years,

could have elapsed between the two events, must be abandoned. More than one eminent historian and chronologist, *e.g.* Baronius, Pagi, Pearson, Tillemont, have seen and felt this difficulty, and have in consequence constructed a chronological scheme different to the above.

Bishop Pearson, for instance, in his Annales Paulini, arranges the dates as follows: He places the martyrdom of Stephen in the end of 34, and the conversion of Saul in the beginning of 35, the remainder of which year, the whole of 36 and part of 37, he makes him spend in Arabia.

He places his return to Damascus in 37, and puts his escape from that city and his visit to S. Peter at Jerusalem about the close of the year following. He thinks that he spent *three* years, *i.e.* from 39 to the middle or close of 42, in Syria and Cilicia (as mentioned by the Apostle to the Galatians); immediately after which Barnabas brings him to Antioch, where he spends the whole of the following year; and in 44 the two are sent together, with the alms of the Antiochenes, to Jerusalem, in which year they received consecration, and set out on their first apostolic journey. His chronological scheme, as compared with that of a few other eminent historians, will then be as follows:—

Conversion: A.D. 31, Burton; 33, Petavius, Cave (Hist. Lit. Vit. S. Pauli); 34, Alex. Natalis, Lightfoot; 35, Usher, Pearson, Tillemont; 36, Baronius, Conybeare and Howson; 37, Basnage; end of 36 or beginning of 37, Lardner; 40, Spanheim, Witsius, Fabricius, Wieseler.

In Arabia: 33, Burton; 35, 6, 7, Tillemont, Cave, Baronius; 40, Basnage.

Damascus: 33, Burton; 37, Pearson, Tillemont, Baronius; 38, Conybeare and Howson; 40, Basnage.

Jerusalem (first visit after the conversion), or fifteen days with S. Peter (Gal. i. 18): 33, Burton; 36, Petavius; 37, Cave, Lightfoot; 38, Usher, Pearson; the close of 38, Tillemont; 39, Baronius, who calculates three years (Gal. i. 18) from the conversion to this time, and does not allow three years in Arabia (§ iv. p. 350); end of 39 or beginning of 40, Lardner.

Cæsarea and Tarsus: 37, Cave; 38, 9, Pearson, Tillemont; 40, Basnage; till 42, Burton; 43, Alex. Natalis; 39 till 43 inclusive, Conybeare and Howson.

Syria and Cilicia: Galat. i. 21, *i.e.* Tarsus of Acts ix. 30 (?), 37, Cave; 40, Petavius; till 42, Pearson, Tillemont, Alex. Natalis, Basnage, Burton; 40, 41, 42, and part of 43, Lardner.

Antioch (from Tarsus): "not long after 37," Cave; 40, Petavius; all 43, Pearson, Tillemont, Alex. Natalis; till the beginning of 44, Burton, Lardner; all 44, Conybeare and Howson.

Jerusalem, with alms (second visit after the conversion);

41, Petavius; 43, Lightfoot; 44, Usher, Pearson, Tillemont, Baronius, Alex. Natalis, Burton; before Easter, Acts xii. 3 (Easter this year fell on March 31), 45, Conybeare and Howson.

Herod Agrippa's death: 44, Pearson, Tillemont, Petavius, Cave, Burton, Basnage, Lardner, Lightfoot, Conybeare and Howson; 46, Baronius.

Bishop Pearson's account seems to be weak in that, whilst he makes S. Paul to have escaped from Damascus at the beginning of 38, he does not bring him to Jerusalem till the close of that year. There is no hint in the ninth chapter of Acts that any such period elapsed, and it must consequently have been inserted by Pearson from conjecture, and from the necessity of his case.

Again, the Bishop makes S. Paul to have spent three complete years, viz. from 39 to 42, in Syria and Cilicia, and brings him back to Tarsus in the latter year:

'Saulus redit Tarsum postquam multa passus erat in Syria et Cilicia *per triennium*.'

It might, perhaps, be argued that the sacred text does not allow so long a time to have been passed in those countries; at least, if we are to be guided by what it tells us of the contemporaneous history of the Church in Jerusalem. All that we read of as having happened there between the going of Saul to Tarsus, and Barnabas fetching him thence, is the news of what had been done at Antioch, not since the departure of Saul, but since the martyrdom of Stephen; the consequent mission of Barnabas; and Barnabas' journey to Tarsus. The last two events may not have occupied more than a year; and S. Paul's own words to the Galatians (i. 21), 'I came into the regions of Syria and Cilicia,' would not appear *à priori* to require a longer period.

We offer this merely as a possible objection to giving S. Paul so long a time in Syria and Cilicia; for we must be careful not to leave a number of years unaccounted for in Palestine, simply to extend S. Paul's work in Syria and Cilicia, or we shall be very literally fulfilling the proverb, and robbing Peter to pay Paul. On the other hand, we willingly admit that if Bishop Pearson's words, 'multa passus erat,' are meant to refer, as we suppose they are, to 2 Cor. xi. 24—27, and include seven scourgings and three shipwrecks, it is scarcely possible to avoid the conclusion that he must have been engaged in operations too extensive to have been effected in the space of a single year;[1] and in this case we must allow that the events related

[1] And see Conybeare and Howson, vol. i. chaps. iii. and iv.; and vol. ii. chap. xvii.; note on 2 Cor. xi. 25.

in the 19th verse of the 11th chapter of the Acts followed Saul's departure for Tarsus at a greater distance of time than would appear as they stand described in the text.

Dr. Burton's scheme we think still more open to objection. Putting the conversion as far back as A.D. 31, he has no way of filling up the time till 44 but by extending the stay at Tarsus, including the journeys in Syria and Cilicia, over nine years, *i.e.* from 33 to 42, during which time, as Dr. Burton himself admits, we know nothing whatever of his acts.

Thus far, then, we conclude that, although the scheme of Wieseler obviates the occurrence of periods of time possibly unaccounted for in the sacred text, which can only be filled up by conjecture, yet there is against him the aforesaid opinion of the most trustworthy authorities, and the well-known assertion of S. Chrysostom, that S. Paul served Christ as an Apostle thirty-five years. If this assertion is to be taken literally, and the conversion is postponed to the year 40, the martyrdom cannot have taken place till 75; whereas it has been recorded from the earliest ages that he was beheaded at the latter end (*i.e.* most probably in the last year) of the reign of Nero. For this reason we give our opinion, in opposition to that of Wieseler, that the conversion took place from about the years 34 to 36. Lightfoot arrives at the same conclusion, by the following computation. He calculates (we must be content with merely stating the fact) that the Council of Jerusalem was held in the year 50, and as that was seventeen years from the conversion (Gal. i. 18; ii. 1), it follows that that event happened in 33, 34.

The conclusion is that there is a space of three years not accounted for. It is impossible to decide whether they were spent in Damascus the second time, or in Cilicia, or partly in both. Bishop Pearson, for the reasons given above, makes them to have been spent in Cilicia. Paley thinks they were passed in Damascus, because of the expression of 'many days' in Acts ix. 23; the same words being found in 1 Kings ii. 38, 39, where they denote a period which the following verse explains to be one of three years. This difficulty of course cannot be solved. In every other respect it appears to us that Pearson's system of chronology is perfectly correct.

Our next point of calculation must be from the death of Herod Agrippa to the Council of Jerusalem; and in forming it we have two independent sources of information—the account in the Acts of what was done by S. Paul during that time, and his declaration to the Galatians that fourteen years after his visit to S. Peter at Jerusalem he returned to that city. It is usually considered—and our authors, in a long and elaborately

worked-out argument, appear to us to have proved—that this was the Apostle's *third* visit to Jerusalem; *i.e.* not the one which he made with Barnabas when they brought thither the alms of the Church of Antioch (which was his second visit), but the visit which he made (also with Barnabas) on the occasion of the holding of the Council; for S. Paul says firstly, that he took Titus with him, who is not mentioned in the 11th of the Acts, from the language of which, however, it is evident that he would have been named with Barnabas, had he accompanied them; and secondly, he 'communicated unto them the Gospel,' of which there is no trace in S. Luke's account. To this we will suggest a third, and, we venture to think, a not less cogent reason, viz. that there were not fourteen years, or anything like fourteen years, between the first and second visits, but five or six at the most.

The *ordo rerum* between Herod's death and the Council is as follows:—

The return to Antioch.

The ordination.

The first Apostolic journey to Cyprus, Perga, Antioch in Pisidia, Iconium, Lystra, Derbe, Lystra, Iconium and Antioch again; Perga, Attalia and Antioch (in Syria), where they stayed a long time.

The Council at Jerusalem.

It remains to be seen as nearly as possible how long this journey must have occupied.

It seems clear that S. Paul and Barnabas, if ordained, as is most likely, and as seems to be implied by the sacred text, soon after their return from Jerusalem, in 44, would not, or rather could not, have set sail for Cyprus till the spring of the following year, when (on the 6th ides of March, *i.e.* the 10th) the sea was opened. This, therefore, we may with Pearson assume to have been the period of their setting out on their journey. Messrs. Howson and Conybeare have, in fact, almost settled to demonstration that it was so, although they put the journey itself two years later, an arrangement which we think faulty, as it keeps the Apostles unemployed at Antioch till 48.

'If we suppose him,' they say, 'to have been at Perga in May, this would have been exactly the most natural time for a journey to the mountains. Earlier in the spring the passes would have been filled with snow. In the heat of summer the weather would have been less favourable for the journey. In the autumn the disadvantages would have been still greater, from the approaching difficulties of winter. But again, if S. Paul was at Perga in May, a further reason may be given why he did not stay there, but seized all the advantages of the season for prosecuting his journey to the interior. The habits of a people are always determined or modified by the physical peculiarities of their country; and a custom prevails amongst the inhabitants of this part of Asia Minor, which there is every reason to believe has been unbroken

for centuries. At the beginning of the hot season they move up from the plains to the cool basin-like hollows in the mountains. These *yailahs*, or summer retreats, are always spoken of with pride and satisfaction, and the time of the journey anticipated with eager delight. When the time arrives, the people may be seen ascending to the upper grounds, men, women, and children, with flocks and herds, camels and asses, like the patriarchs of old. If, then, S. Paul was in Perga in May, he would find the inhabitants deserting its hot and silent streets. They would be moving in the direction of his own intended journey. He would be under no temptation to stay. And if we imagine him as joining some such company of Pamphylian families on his way to the Pisidian mountains, it gives much interest and animation to the thought of this part of his progress.'—Vol. i. p. 199.

The passage in which they describe the recently discovered site of Antioch is so important and so graphic, that our readers will thank us for relieving the dry detail on which we have been engaged, by extracting it.

'The Sultan Tareek, or Turkish royal road from Adalia to Kiutayah and Constantinople, passes due north by the beautiful lake of Buldur. The direction of Antioch in Pisidia bears more to the east. After passing somewhere near Selge and Sagalassus, S. Paul approached by the margin of the much larger, though perhaps not less beautiful, lake of Eyerdir. The position of the city is not far from the northern shore of this lake, at the base of a mountain range which stretches through Phrygia in a south-easterly direction. It is, however, not many years since this statement could be confidently made. Strabo, indeed, describes its position with remarkable clearness and precision. His words are as follows: "In the district of Phrygia called Paroreia, there is a certain mountain-ridge, stretching from east to west. On each side there is a large plain below this ridge; and it has two cities in its neighbourhood—Philomelium on the north, and on the other side Antioch, called Antioch near Pisidia. The former lies entirely in the plain, the latter, which has a Roman colony, is on a height." With this description before him, and taking into account certain indications of distance furnished by ancient authorities, Colonel Leake, who has perhaps done more for the elucidation of classical topography than any other man, felt that Ak-Sher, the position assigned to Antioch by D'Anville, and other geographers, could not be the true place. Ak-Sher is on the north of the ridge, and the position could not be made to harmonise with the Tables. But he was not in possession of any information which could lead him to the true position; and the problem remained unsolved, till Mr. Arundell started from Smyrna, in 1833, with the deliberate purpose of discovering the scene of St. Paul's labours. He successfully proved that Ak-Sher is Philomelium, and that Antioch is at Yalobatch, on the other side of the ridge. The narrative of his successful journey is very interesting; and every Christian ought to sympathise with the pleasure with which, knowing that Antioch was seventy miles from Apamea, and forty-five from Apollonia, he first succeeded in identifying Apollonia; and then, exactly at the right distance, perceived, in the tombs near a fountain, and the vestiges of an ancient road, sure indications of his approach to a ruined city; and then saw, across the plain, the remains of an aqueduct at the base of the mountain; and finally, arrived at Jalobatch, ascended to the elevation described by Strabo, and felt, as he looked on the superb ruins around, that he was really on the spot consecrated by the labours and persecution of the Apostles Paul and Barnabas.'—Vol. i. pp. 204, 205.

To return. It is not likely, from the nature of the case, that S. Paul and S. Barnabas spent more than a few weeks in Cyprus, and we quite agree with Conybeare and Howson that on the present occasion they made no stay at Perga; but merely (as

S. Luke implies, v. 14) passed through it. The stay at Antioch in Pisidia could scarcely have exceeded two complete weeks, for after the second Sabbath they were driven from the city and came to Iconium, where they spent 'a long time,' *ἱκανὸν χρόνον*. From Iconium they made Lystra and Derbe their head-quarters, whilst evangelizing the neighbourhood. It is not probable that the Jews who pursued them from Iconium would have allowed any considerable period to elapse before the renewal of their efforts for their destruction, and consequently they could hardly have remained at Lystra longer at the most than a few weeks. At Derbe they were undisturbed, and, as S. Luke says, 'They preached the Gospel to the city, and taught many,' they must have spent some time there. On their return visit to Lystra, Iconium, and Antioch, they stayed long enough to confirm the Churches, and at Perga they employed themselves in the performance of the work of Apostles. Lastly, S. Luke expressly says that they stayed at Antioch (before the Council) a long time.

From these facts it appears to us that the period of three years allotted to the journey by Pearson cannot be far wrong either way, and thus the return to Antioch will be brought down to about the time of the closing of the sea in November, 47; and the long period spent in that city will bring on the Council of Jerusalem to 49 or 50. Should this calculation be thought correct, the year of the conversion will be carried back to 32 or 33. Thirty-two is plainly too early; but 33 agrees with S. Chrysostom's assertion, that S. Paul was Christ's servant thirty-five years, if his martyrdom be put in 68, which is perhaps the best date for it; and makes the conversion to have happened within the same twelve months as the crucifixion, 33 being the date of the latter in the eclipses from which is calculated the canon of Ptolemy, and that which is adopted by the Alexandrian Chronicle, Petavius, Cave, Usher, Pearson, and Labbæus. It is certain that the chronologists and historians of greatest authority put the Council either in 49 or 50. With the former are to be ranked Pearson and Petavius: among the latter are the names of Basnage, Lardner, Lightfoot, Wieseler, and Conybeare and Howson. Alexander Natalis Baronius, and Tillemont prefer the year 51: Usher puts it in 52, Spanheim in 53, Burton would have it held as early as 46, and Cave a year later.

We have now to calculate from the Council of Jerusalem to the Apostle's first imprisonment at Rome; and we must beware of allowing for this portion of his career, as some have inadvertently done, a shorter time than the acts S. Luke relates to have been performed by him require, and than the sacred text allows.

The time occupied by the second Apostolic journey, from the

departure to the return to Antioch (Acts xv. 36; xviii. 22 inclusive), cannot on the surface of the history have been less than three years, and a little examination will show that it really occupied more. Paul and Silas left for Asia at the same time as Barnabas and John Mark sailed for Cyprus, which would most probably be as soon as the sea was open, in March. They visited Derbe and Lystra, where Timothy joined them; they passed through Phrygia, Galatia, and Mysia, to Troas; there with Luke (Acts xvi. 10) they embarked for Macedonia, and on the second day they landed at Neapolis; whence they passed straightly to Philippi. Hitherto there has been nothing to cause any great delay; and from the narrative in the Acts, it would appear that they had made no considerable halt anywhere. From an expression in the Galatians, however (iv. 13), Messrs. Conybeare and Howson, in a passage which, like so many others in their book, would be greatly improved by a rigid compression, infer that a fit of sickness overtook the Apostle in Galatia. This idea we think not without reason; and if correct, it is of course impossible to conjecture how long the travellers were delayed. After landing in Macedonia, they passed through or stayed but a short time in Neapolis, and thence went into Philippi, where S. Luke's words, 'We were in that city abiding certain days' (Acts xvi. 12), and again, (v. 18), 'This she did many days,' point to the conclusion that they stayed some considerable time. Passing through Amphipolis and Lycaonia, they spent three Sabbath days at Thessalonica, soon after the last of which, as appears from Acts xvii. 5, the Jews made an uproar. Immediately, on this (v. 10), the brethren sent Paul and Silas away by night to Berœa, from whence they were despatched (v. 14) by sea to Athens. Rosenmüller, Conybeare and Howson, and Alford, thus understand the words of S. Luke, differing from Grotius, Wolfius, and others, who have thought from the words ὡς ἐπὶ τὴν θάλασσαν (where they, however, seem to construe ὡς as if it were ὡσεί,) that he was brought down to the sea, five miles from Berœa, by stratagem, to deceive his enemies, and when they were thus thrown off the track, was conducted to Athens overland.

At Athens S. Paul waited for Silas and Timothy, who had stayed at Berœa when he left it, but for whom he had sent by the brethren who conducted him to Athens. Unable, however, as it appears (v. 33), to make any considerable impression in the gossiping city, he passed on after no long time to Corinth.

Here he stayed a year and a half and upwards (xviii. 11 and 18); as he left it in the spring, sailing by Ephesus to get to Jerusalem, for the coming feast of Pentecost, it seems certain,

as Conybeare and Howson say, that he must have *arrived* at Athens in autumn; *i.e.* either in the autumn of the year in which he left Antioch (which seems, to say the least, highly improbable), or of the succeeding one. Messrs. Conybeare and Howson prefer the latter, with which view we entirely coincide. Wieseler's calculation, at least, that it took a year to make the journey, can only be correct on the supposition that it was begun in the autumn. Now one year and a half expended in reaching Corinth (a period allowed by Messrs. Conybeare and Howson, Basnage, and Lardner), the same space of time spent in the city, and a few months allowed in which to return to Antioch and as a general margin (weeks would hardly be enough for both purposes), will give a total of about three and a half years, or rather more, which is the time allowed by Messrs. Conybeare and Howson, who make S. Paul begin his journey in the spring of 51, and conclude it soon after Pentecost of 54; and very nearly that allowed by Pearson, who puts the commencement of the journey in the middle or towards autumn of 50, and the termination at the same time as do Messrs. Conybeare and Howson.

S. Paul's visit to Corinth is notable for the fact, that in the course of it he wrote the first two, in order of time, of his Epistles, directing them from Corinth to the Thessalonians.

Timothy and Silas had stayed behind at Berœa, and S. Paul, as narrated above, had sent for them to join him at Athens, which they did. He, however, preferring the good of the Thessalonians to his own comfort, sent Timothy back to them, and he returned to the Apostle at Corinth. This we gather from a comparison of Acts xvii. 15, 'And they that conducted Paul 'brought him to Athens: and receiving a commandment unto 'Silas and Timotheus for to come unto him with all speed, they 'departed;' and 1 Thess. iii. 1, 2, 'Wherefore when we 'could no longer forbear, we thought it good to be left at Athens 'alone; and sent Timotheus, our brother, and minister of God, 'and our fellow-labourer in the Gospel of Christ, to establish 'you, and to comfort you concerning your faith;' with v. 6, 'But now when Timotheus came from you unto us:' which corresponds with Acts xviii. 5, 'When Silas and Timotheus were come from Macedonia.'

This First Epistle to the Thessalonians, therefore, was evidently written, not at Athens, as stated in our Bibles at the end of the Epistle, but at Corinth. And as Silvanus (or Silas) is mentioned with Timothy in the commencement of the Second as well as of the First Epistle, it seems undoubted that the two Epistles were written at the same place, and nearly at the same time.

Another event worthy of especial notice happened at Corinth. S. Paul here found Aquila and Priscilla, who were 'lately' come from Italy, in consequence of the edict of Claudius, which banished all Jews from Rome. This edict was issued, as some think, in the year 49-50; and as according to our computation S. Paul met Aquila and Priscilla in the autumn of 52, it is evident that if the above can be established as the true date of the edict, our computation must be erroneous. But this is by no means the case. Orosius, an author of the early part of the fifth century, is the only authority for that date. He cites Josephus for the assertion, that the edict was issued in the ninth year of Claudius, A.D. 49. Josephus, however, not only says nothing of the *time* at which the edict was issued, but does not even mention the edict itself. Bishop Pearson too, with whom agree many others, maintains, and in fact proves, that Orosius was misled by the Chronicon of Eusebius into an error by 'prochronismus' of two years; and consequently that the beginning of 52, the eleventh and not the ninth of Claudius, was the true year of the edict.

We come now to S. Paul's *third* apostolical journey. The second, as we gather from the sacred narrative, to which as subsidiary is to be added the general consent of historians, had occupied a space of four years, or a little more, *i.e.* as we have put it (with Pearson, Tillemont, Conybeare, Howson, and others), from the spring of 50 to Pentecost, 54; and there is no evidence from S. Luke that after his return to Antioch he spent any very long time there before commencing his third journey.

He set out on this journey from Antioch apparently at the end of the same year—54—in which he arrived at that city. He travelled through Galatia and Phrygia, which would probably take up the remainder of the year, and arrived at Ephesus, where he spent two years and three months, speaking with the Jews in the synagogue for three months, and with the Christians alone, in the school of Tyrannus, for two years. Part of this time was spent, as Conybeare and Howson, Tillemont, and others think, in a brief visit to Corinth. The grounds on which Conybeare and Howson found this opinion are the following assertions in the Second Epistle to the Corinthians: 'Behold, 'the third time I am ready to come to you; and I will not be 'burdensome to you' (xii. 14). 'This is the third time I am 'coming to you' (xiii. 1). 'For I fear, lest, when I come, I shall 'not find you such as I would, and that I shall be found unto 'you such as you would not: lest there be debates, envyings, 'strifes, backbitings, whisperings, swellings, tumults: and lest, 'when I come again my God will humble me among you, and

'that I shall bewail many which have sinned already' (xii. 20, 21). We may add that there was nothing in his first visit to the city to cause such feelings on his part as are referred to in this verse; and they cite in support of the above the reading of the uncial MSS. 2 Cor. ii. 1: 'But I determined this with myself,' *μὴ πάλιν ἐν λύπῃ πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐλθεῖν*, and xiii. 2, *προείρηκα καὶ προλέγω, ὡς πάρων τὸ δεύτερον, καὶ ἀπὼν νῦν γράφω τοῖς προημαρτηκόσι καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς πᾶσιν, ὅτι ἐὰν ἔλθω εἰς τὸ πάλιν, οὐ φείσομαι* (the *γράφω* not being found in the best MSS.).

We agree with our authors that the natural and primary meaning of the above citations is in favour of the affirmative view, and that the contrary, maintained by Paley and some others, can only be supported by explaining it away. S. Paul had visited Corinth in his second apostolical journey; and if, soon after leaving Ephesus, he spoke of a *third* journey, there must have been some second one made previously, and this could only have been done when he was at Ephesus. However this be, we are now brought to the summer of 57, at which time he sent before him into Macedonia Timothy and Erastus, directing the former apparently to go on to Corinth (1 Cor. iv. 17; xvi. 10); received Apollos and others from Corinth; and wrote the First Epistle to the Corinthians (1 Cor. xvi. 8), and the Epistle to the Galatians. Thus, the Apostle spent here altogether nearly three actual years; but he did not, it appears, remain, as he had originally intended (1 Cor. xvi. 9), till the following Pentecost, having been driven away by the tumult of Demetrius. He crossed over into Macedonia, where he wrote the Second Epistle to the Corinthians (2 Cor. ix. 2), traversed the country as far as Illyricum, and proceeded into Greece. This journey is mentioned in the Epistle to the Romans, xv. 19, 'From Jerusalem and round about unto Illyricum *I have fully preached the Gospel of Christ.*' S. Luke does not make mention of it in direct terms, but he appears to allude to it in Acts xx. 1, 2, 'He departed for to go into Macedonia. And 'when he had gone over those parts, and given them much 'exhortation, he came into Greece.' He remained in Greece three months. A portion of this time seems to have been spent, although it is not mentioned by S. Luke, at Corinth, where, as internal evidence shows, he wrote the Epistle to the Romans. For, firstly, he mentions (ch. xvi. 23) Erastus, who is known to have been chamberlain (*ὁ οἰκόνομος*, treasurer) of the city, and to have lived there (2 Tim. iv. 20). Secondly, the companions who had accompanied him into Greece (Acts xx. 4) were Sopater, Aristarchus, Secundus, Gaius, Timotheus, Tychicus; and of these the names of Sopater, Gaius, and Timotheus, are found in Romans xvi. 21, 23. Thirdly, the Epistle was written

after he had left Ephesus, because, whilst Aquila and Priscilla had been with him in that city (1 Cor. xvi. 19), he sends them in this a greeting as having now returned to Rome. Lastly, it was written after the Second of Corinthians, because the collection mentioned in that Epistle as still in progress (2 Cor. viii. ix.) is spoken of in Romans as being now complete; S. Paul being, as he says, about to go to Jerusalem with it (Rom. xv. 25, 26).

From Corinth S. Paul returned through Greece and Macedonia, and reached Philippi in the spring of 58. It has been a question, whether or not it were possible for him to arrive at Jerusalem for Pentecost. It seems that it certainly was so. The following accurate and decisive calculation of time is given by Messrs. Conybeare and Howson:—

'It may be well to point out here the general distribution of the time spent on the voyage. Forty-nine days intervened between Passover and Pentecost. The days of unleavened bread (Mark xiv. 12, Luke xxii. 7, Acts xii. 3, 1 Cor. v.'8) succeeded the Passover. Thus S. Paul stayed at least *seven* days at Philippi after the Passover (v. 6); *five* days were spent on the passage to Troas (*ib.*), *six* days (for so we may reckon them) were spent at Troas (*ib.*), *four* were occupied on the voyages by Chios to Miletus (vv. 13-15), *two* were spent at Miletus—in *three* days S. Paul went by Cos and Rhodes to Patara (xxi. 1); *two* days would suffice for the voyage to Tyre (vv. 2, 3), *six* days were spent at Tyre (v. 4), *two* were taken up in proceeding by Ptolemais to Cæsarea (vv. 7, 8). This calculation gives us *thirty-seven* days in all; thus leaving *thirteen* before the festival of Pentecost, after the arrival at Cæsarea, which is more than the conditions require. We may add, if necessary, two or three days more during the voyage in the cases where we have reckoned inclusively." —Vol. ii. P. 253, note 1.

There must be allowed for this journey a period of nearly four years, *i.e.* from the autumn of 54 to Pentecost, 58. Two years after that date he was sent prisoner to Rome, having been shipwrecked in the winter of 60, and arriving at Rome in the following spring. Two years later still, he quitted the city, having whilst there written his Epistles to the Philippians, Ephesians, Colossians, and to Philemon. It has been questioned whether S. Paul at this time pleaded his cause, personally or otherwise, before Nero, or not. Lightfoot, Lardner, and Messrs. Conybeare and Howson, hold the affirmative; among their opponents are Doddridge and Spanheim. Lightfoot argues from Philippians i. 13 and 2 Timothy iv. 16. The latter, however, clearly applies to the second, and not the first visit to the city.

The subsequent movements of the Apostle are a matter of mere calculation, or rather of conjecture, since there are hardly any data from which to construct a scheme. From his departure from Rome to his martyrdom, we have only a few scattered and partial notices of his movements in the pastoral epistles.

It is probable from Romans xv. 24, the words of S. Clement[1], and the tradition of the East, as preserved by S. Chrysostom and Theodoret, that he went to Spain; but if so, he certainly again visited the East. It is certain both that he personally introduced Titus to the future sphere of his duties in Crete, and that not only we do not read of his visiting that island on any former occasion, but that, from the full and exact account we have of all his former journeys, it is scarcely possible that he could have done so. He seems to have visited Colosse, of which city Philemon was a native (Phil. 22). Although he had formerly taken his leave of the Church of Ephesus, he revisited it, leaving Timothy there, while he went into Macedonia (1 Tim. i. 3). He went to Philippi, and wintered A.D. 65, in Nicopolis: the Nicopolis of Epirus no doubt (Titus iii. 12), where Messrs. Conybeare and Howson think that he was arrested; but others considered that he travelled from Nicopolis to Corinth, 2 Tim. iv. 20, and thence to Troas, where he left the cloak, books, and parchments, mentioned in 2 Tim. iv. 13. From Troas his route is laid down to Miletus, and thence to Rome, where, as Bishop Pearson says, 'Paulus cum per bien-'nium et amplius persecutio Romæ antea cessasset, et jam Nero 'in Græcia esset, Romam petit—sed Romam invenit alterum 'Neronem.' A. D. 66-7.

As the Apostle's movements are thus uncertain, and as we have no better means of approximating the date of his martyrdom than by calculation from them: the year of that event must necessarily be uncertain too. Some of the early Fathers have said that S. Peter and S. Paul suffered together; others, that they suffered on the same day indeed, but that the martyrdom of S. Peter preceded that of S. Paul by a year. Here we are again at a loss, and meet with a fresh perplexity; and the authorities for each opinion are about equal. In the former class are to be reckoned, Eusebius in his Chronicon; S. Epiphanius; the ancient Roman Calendar, published by Boucher; S. Jerome, and Asterius. A council of seventy bishops, held

[1] S. Clement to the Romans (I. § 55) says: 'S. Paul went to the extremity of the West,' previously to his martyrdom. The words have proved, as might be expected, a fruitful source of controversy. 'In a Roman author,' say Messrs. Conybeare and Howson, 'the *extremity of the West* could mean nothing short of Spain, and the expression is often used by Roman writers to denote Spain.' Here then we have the express testimony of S. Paul's own disciple, that he fulfilled his original intention (mentioned Rom. xv. 24-28) of visiting the Spanish Peninsula, and consequently that he was liberated from his first imprisonment at Rome. S. Chrysostom on 2 Tim. iv. 10, says directly, that 'after his stay at Rome he went into Spain,' quoted by Messrs. Conybeare and Howson. S. Jerome agrees with him, as does Theodoret on Philipp. i. 25. Pearson makes him set out on this journey immediately on leaving Rome, and gives him the year 63 in which to make it.

at Rome, under Pope Gelasius, about the year 494, says, with great boldness: 'S. Paul did not, as the heretics blab, suffer at 'a different time from S. Peter, but at the same time, and on 'one and the same day.' Harduin Councils, ii. p. 938. Taken from this, beyond a doubt, is the assertion in almost the same words found in the Codex Romanus, a compilation of the end of the fourth or beginning of the fifth century, and published among the works of S. Leo: 'Sanctus Paulus uno die unoque 'tempore gloriosa morte cum Petro, sub principe Nerone, agoni-'zans coronatus est.' Op. S. Leonis, Lugden. MDCC.

We must remember that among the 'heretics' of Gelasius are to be reckoned possibly S. Dionysius of Corinth, who merely says, that they suffered *κατὰ τὸν αὔτον καίρον*, and certainly S. Augustin. Be the fact as it may, the year of S. Paul's martyrdom is in the highest degree uncertain; and in attempting to solve the difficulty two questions have to be considered; firstly: Did the martyrdom take place in Nero's presence or not? and secondly, On what day was it consummated?

If it took place in Nero's presence, as that emperor left Italy in the autumn of 66, and did not return to it till the 29th of March, 68, destroying himself on the 9th of June following, it must either have happened before the winter of the former year, or early in the latter. But as regards the day of the martyrdom, we are again at fault. History mentions two days, February 22 and June 29, and the evidence is so evenly balanced that it is quite useless at this distance of time to hope to decide between them. Pearson adopts the former; Tillemont the latter. S. Clement of Rome, indeed, seems to lend us some aid in the difficulty, and, perhaps, the best we have; but his words have before now been strained to mean more than they contain. He writes to the Corinthians that the Apostle bore testimony *ἐπὶ τῶν ἡγουμένων*: *i. e.* under the prefects of the city among whose duties it was, as we know from Tertullian, S. Cyprian, and many others, to have the judgment and decision as to the death of the Christian martyrs. If we are to conclude from these words that the event we are discussing took place when Nero was absent from the city—a thing for many reasons unlikely—it may have taken place at any time from the autumn of 66 to the end of March, 68.

There is a circumstance, indeed, which might fix it to a year earlier than any named yet; viz. 65; and Pagi, a name of no light authority, accordingly adopts this as the date. Orosius says, that the martyrdom of the two Apostles was followed by the infliction on the city of a plague and tempest, and Tillemont cites Tacitus to prove that a plague actually did happen in the autumn of 65. But it is not likely that Orosius, an author of

the fifth century, would certainly know that the two Apostles did suffer on the same day; and Tillemont has proved that in this particular assertion, as in so many others, the testimony of Orosius is, in fact, valueless. Eusebius, as we have said, puts the martyrdom in the last year of Nero, and S. Jerome, in one place, agrees with him. He says, in his brief sketch of S. Paul's life ('Scriptores Ecclesiastici,' cap. i.): 'Hic quarto-decimo 'Neronis anno, eodem die quo Petrus, Romæ pro Christo capite 'truncatur.' It is to be lamented that he does not always agree with himself on the subject: a page or two farther on in the same work (cap. xii.) he affirms that Seneca died two years before S. Peter and S. Paul. This would place the death of these Apostles in 67: a year in which none of the ancients but S. Jerome (if we may trust to the assertion of Tillemont) place it. The opinion of a few of the chief authorities may be seen below.

	First Imprisonment.		Second Imprisonment and Martyrdom.
S. Jerome	56	Cave (Hist. Litt.)	63
Burton	—	Lardner	64-5
Petavius	—	Basnage	65
Cave	57	Pagi	—
Alexander Natalis	59	S. Epiphanius	66
Baronius	—	Burton	—
Basnage	60	Tillemont	—
Davidson	61	Petavius	67
Lardner	—	Usher	—
Pearson	—	Eusebius	68
Tillemont	—	S. Jerome	—
Wieseler	—	Conybeare and Howson	—
Conybeare and Howson	62	Fabricius	—
Usher	63	Pearson	—
		Alexander Natalis	69
		Baronius	—

Our readers therefore will see that we venture to differ from Messrs. Conybeare and Howson as to the dates of the year of the conversion, and of the departure on and the return from the first apostolical journey. They adopt for the first of these events the year 36, and for the other two 48 and 49. We place the conversion in 34, and think, with Bishop Pearson, that the journey extended from the spring of 45 to the closing of the sea in 47.

As we cannot expect to follow our authors *pari passu* through their full and elaborate volumes, we will now confine our remarks to what are perhaps the most interesting portions of the life of the great Apostle: his three years' stay at Antioch, and his voyage to Rome and shipwreck; and conclude with brief notice of the opinion of our authors as to the source of the heresies of the Apostolic age.

At Ephesus, in the worship of Diana—based on the sanctity of the pretended heaven-sent image, and carried on in that splendid temple, which as our readers know was one of the seven wonders of the world: with a ritual in many respects pure and lofty, and which undoubtedly shadowed forth in some slight degree, if indeed it were not based on, the important truth of the need of vicarious atonement—the Apostle had to contend with a system which had all the prestige of antiquity and of the *genius loci*, aided by the appliances of wealth, splendour, and refinement to recommend it.

For in the temple of Diana—the common work of united Greece, with all its pomp and glory of architectural grandeur: a pomp and glory which perhaps have never been excelled or even equalled: its many regal offerings: its band of virgin priestesses; and its wealth beyond count—if anywhere in heathendom, the *genius loci*, aided by that nameless awe and reverence which must have sprung from the presence of a token held to have been the immediate gift of heaven, must surely have been most powerful.

The temple as it appeared in S. Paul's time is well described by our authors.

'The reader will bear in mind the characteristic style which was assumed by Greek architecture, and which has suggested many of the images of the New Testament. It was quite different from the lofty and ascending form of those buildings which have since arisen in all parts of Christian Europe, and essentially consisted in horizontal entablatures, resting on vertical columns. In another respect, also, the temples of the ancients may be contrasted with our churches and cathedrals. They were not roofed over for the reception of a large company of worshippers, but were in fact colonnades, erected as subsidiary decorations round the cell which contained the idol, and were, through a great part of their space, open to the sky.'—Vol. ii. p. 86.

Its construction had been most elaborate. We learn from Pliny that to avoid the shock of earthquakes, it was built on a marshy spot, and that to secure a solid foundation for his work, Chresiphon, its chief architect, had rammed down into a deep foundation layers of charred wood, and on them had placed fleeces of wool. The length of the temple, he informs us, was 425 feet, and the width 220. It was supported by, or rather chiefly consisted of, 127 columns, 60 feet in height, and each the gift of a king. Thirty-six of these were cælatæ, *i.e.* either coloured and gilded, or more probably carved with bas-reliefs.[1] The folding-doors were of cypress wood, and lasted, according to Pliny and Theophrastus, 400 years. The roof was of cedar, and the stairs were formed of the wood of a single vine. The rest of the wood employed about it was ebony.

[1] Conybeare and Howson, chap. xvi.

But, however splendid the temple, the image which it enshrined was in itself mean and paltry. Hence perhaps it was that, whilst it was by some considered to have fallen from heaven, others thought it the work of the Amazons, the supposed original builders of the temple. The material of which it was made spoke, one would have thought, with sufficient plainness of its terrestrial origin. It was of wood—either ebony, or some other wood blackened by art, to represent the goddess' supremacy over night. Herodianus gives a description of it, but his ὡς λεγούσι when mentioning its fall from heaven is not without significance (i. 35).

The image of the goddess was not that of the Greek Diana, the huntress with her bow and quiver; but of the Asiatic Artemis, the 'many-breasted' personification of fruitful nature. 'Her head was surrounded by a mural crown; her body was 'covered with the representation of different kind of animals 'and fruits; her hands were expanded and supported by props; 'and her feet were pressed close together and bound.' Besides this statue, however, there was originally, according to Callimachus, another of the goddess, in her attributes as huntress, erected by the Amazons near the sea-shore.

> Σοὶ καὶ Ἀμαζόνιδες πολέμου ἐπιθυμήτειραι
> Ἐν κότε παῤῥαλίῃ Ἐφέσου βρέτας ἱδρύσαντο
> Φηγῷ ὑπὸ πρέμνῳ.—*Hymn to Diana*, v. 237.

Pausanias says it was all gilt,[1] and thus of course it cannot be identified with the other.

The priests who served the goddess were, as Strabo tells us, eunuchs. They held a high place in the city, and at their head was a high priest called Essen; which, according to Suidas and others, signifies the King of the Bees. Associated with them was a band of virgin priestesses termed Melissæ, who, according to Messrs. Conybeare and Howson, were divided into three classes, and served under one high priestess. Their powers, like those of the priests, were very great; but an infraction of their vow of chastity was punished by death.

'The worship of Diana, and the practice of magic,' say Messrs. Conybeare and Howson, 'are closely connected,' and we should take a very imperfect view of the religious condition of Ephesus at this time, if we supposed that the worship of the goddess was the only enemy with which the Christian Apostle had to contend. There was the arcana of Ephesian magic, the most prominent place in which was occupied by those mystical words and letters known by the name of Ephesian numbers, the faith of the people in which was unbounded: whilst the

[1] Note of Vulcanius on Callimachus, v. 238. And see Spanheim's "Observationes in Callimachi hymnos."

practisers of curious arts, termed *περιέργοι* by S. Luke, probably with the noted Apollonius of Tyana at their head, claimed to appeal to and deal with, if they did not even control, the unseen powers; and lastly, S. Chrysostom tells us, that Pythagoras, Parmenides, Zeno, Democritus, and many other philosophers, had visited the city, and had no doubt left behind them the results of their teaching.

Ephesus, as we learn from Plutarch, had been in the reign of Philip and Alexander the chief abode of magicians. The Ephesian letters are said by S. Clement of Alexandria to have been ascribed *μυθικώτερον δέ*, to the priests of Cybele, who dwelt at the foot of Mount Ida (Strom i. xv.). Gude suggests that they were the invention of the priests of Egypt, who used them in their capacity of physicians, in doubtful and dangerous cases. They consisted of certain words supposed, as Pausanias says, by their natural power to drive away evil. S. Clement speaks of them as follows:

'Androcydes, the Pythagorean, says, that the Ephesian letters, which are very celebrated with many, hold the place of symbols; *ἄσκιον* signifies darkness, for darkness has no shadow; *κατάσκιον* signifies light, for light makes the shadow bright; *λίξ* is the land according to its ancient signification; *τετράς*, the year through its seasons; *δαμναμενός*, the sun who subdues; (*ὁ δαμάζων*,) and *αἴσια*, is the word true. The symbol signifies that Divine things have been arranged relatively as light to darkness, and the sun to the year, and the earth to every kind of generation.'—Strom. v. 8.

The history of Crœsus, and of the two wrestlers, shows that the ancients put no small faith in these letters. Crœsus is related by Eustathius (though our readers will probably prefer the account of Herodotus) to have gained good by repeating them on his funeral pile; and the same author, and Suidas from him, relate that in a contest between an Ephesian and a Milesian wrestler, the latter was unable to throw his antagonist, because he had these words bound on his ankle; but when they were discovered and taken off, the Milesian obtained a speedy victory. Our readers will also recall the words of Menander:

> *Ἐφέσια τοῖς γαμοῦσιν οὗτος περιπατεῖ*
> *λέγων ἀλεξιφάρμακα.*

The Ephesian words were inscribed on the feet, belt, and crown of Diana, who probably for this reason was, as we are told by Tatian, called Magus. (§ 8. Ed. Bened.)

Although such charms would by many of these times be considered simply delusive and senseless, it was, with or without reason, far otherwise with the people of those times; and one of the most celebrated among the pretenders, who used these and other like impostures to their own purposes,

was the Apollonius of Tyana already referred to. He appears in the pages of Philostratus under the two-fold character of a great controller of nature and a philosopher. Hieracles, who, however, is opposed and confuted by Eusebius, compares him with Christ as a worker of miracles. He himself claimed to be a philosopher: the self-taught master of all languages: a prophet; and a worker of miracles. His chief performances in these last two capacities were, according to Philostratus, the foretelling, when at Ephesus, the murder of Domitian at Rome, and the exact moment of its occurrence; casting out devils; causing the fetters with which he was bound to fall from his legs; vanishing from the presence of Domitian, when placed on his trial; healing the sick, and raising to life again a young man, who, however, as it appears, never really died. Among other miraculous achievements, he is said to have freed the city of Ephesus from a pestilential disease, which he found walking about in the form of an old man clothed in rags, and whom he caused to be stoned, and thus saved the place from his ravages. For this the inhabitants erected a statue to him, and paid him Divine honours.[1]

Claims like these appear in themselves worthy of little or no attention. Philostratus, too, the biographer of Apollonius, did not live till a century or more after his death; and he composed his work exclusively from materials that had been left by Damis, an attendant and kind of assistant of Apollonius. Hence we may say with S. Augustine, that his miracles have no author of credit to support them; and, with S. Chrysostom, that they are mere falsehoods and delusions. The moderns also who have examined the subject—Scaliger, Vossius, Tillemont, and others —all adopt the same conclusion.

Apollonius was born at Tyana, in Cappadocia, about the same time, according to Tillemont, as our Lord; and at Agæ, in Cilicia, he was instructed whilst yet a youth by Euxenes in the doctrines of Pythagoras. He travelled to India, visited Babylon and other places, and came to Ephesus in the beginning of Nero's reign.[2] It is at least probable that he was in the city at the same time as S. Paul. If so, it is impossible that the teacher of the new faith, and the man whom heathendom honoured as a god, or at least as a man possessed with the powers of a god, and whom the people of Ephesus imagined themselves to have reason to regard with especial reverence, could have avoided coming in contact.

If such be the case, and if the works recorded of Apollonius, or any resembling them, were actually done, no matter by what

[1] Philostratus. lib. iv. cap. 3, Euseb., cont. Hieroclem, lib. iv. p. 528. Paris, 1628.
[2] Tillemont's Life of Apollonius.

agency, either while S. Paul was at Ephesus, or previously, so that their fame was still extant: they may have formed the reason why, in that place above others, God wrought δυνάμεις οὐ τὰς τυχοῦσας by S. Paul's hands: the same things being mentioned by S. Luke as having been done by the Apostle, viz. the healing of the sick and the casting out of devils, as are claimed by Philostratus for Apollonius.

And in this case how significant is the silence as to details of S. Luke. An ordinary writer would have been eager to record that his master had encountered such a champion, and had at least equalled his performances. Had S. Luke followed this plan, he might indeed have inflicted a death-blow on the fame of the 'philosopher' to future ages; but in the meantime the name of one, who it was better should be at once forgotten, would have been kept alive to prove to many a grievous stumbling-block. Rather than this, the true miracles even of S. Paul should be left unrecorded. And here we cannot but observe, that, considering the great number of magicians so called who were then in existence, and who, if not the subjects of Satanic possession, and the agents through whom he worked, must at least have been possessed of strange sleight of hand, and possibly some peculiar knowledge of the secrets of chemistry, by which they were enabled to delude the uninitiated: even if the conjecture that S. Paul may have met with Apollonius himself be erroneous, there must almost necessarily have been others of the same class at Ephesus and elsewhere, of the contests of the Apostle with whom accounts might have been written resembling the history in the so-called Clementines of the meeting of S. Peter and Simon Magus. But if so, S. Luke was too conscious of the dignity of the Apostle, and the truth of the cause of which he was the champion, to be the one to record them. He knew that in the end truth would prevail, as it did even with the περίεργοι, when they voluntarily destroyed books that were in value above 1,770*l.*

But when these enemies were disposed of; the Jews by his separation from them, and the περίεργοι by the destruction of their books, and the consequent abandonment of their craft; a formidable enemy in the shape of the philosophical systems of the city still remained to be overthrown. To enter into the doctrines of these at any length would be entirely beyond our purpose. Suffice it to say, that to his idea, adopted from the East, of the transmigration of souls, Pythagoras added aspirations of a higher kind, teaching doctrines in essence identical with some of those insisted on by the Apostle. He said that man ought to imitate the Deity, and that there ought to be perfect unity and harmony on the earth; that the body should

be mastered and kept in perfect control; and that God should be worshipped in purity and sincerity of heart. But then came in the favourite heathen idea, not only that these things could be done, but that what gave them their peculiar value was the fact that they *were* done by human nature, unaided by the power and enlightenment of Divine grace. 'Pray to the gods,' said the heathen, 'for the goods of life, for fruitful seasons, for 'abundance in your corn-fields, your olive-yards, and your vine-'yards, for wealth, strength, and prosperity; but pray not to 'them for virtue. Virtue is that attainment for which we are 'rightly praised, and in which we make our boast; and how 'can this be if we have it not from ourselves, but from the 'gods?'

The followers of Democritus held the eternity, and in fact the self-creation and self-subsistence of matter; and placed belief in the Divinity, and even in His existence itself, in the class of delusions. Parmenides and Zeno thought that there was indeed a supreme Governor of all kings, but that even he was subject to the inevitable laws of fate. To this idea they added the pantheistic notion that all souls were emanations from Him, and would either be re-absorbed into Him again, or would be destroyed.

S. Paul, however, by Divine grace proved himself equal to every need. It was not without reason that he stayed in this city longer than he had done in any other at one time since his ordination. Rome, as we know from Juvenal and Horace, was far from being a city of active or fervent religious worship, or even of decent morality. Athens was given up to speculative novelties, Alexandria to commerce. Ephesus alone claimed to stand pre-eminently forward in religious worship; and though we know that that claim rested on nothing more substantial at bottom than the temporal gains accruing to those who aided it and kept it alive: yet it was of all places in the known world the one most adapted for becoming the sphere of the labours of a Christian Apostle. S. Paul indeed, the Apostle of the whole Gentile world, *could* not in his journeys through Asia have passed by a city of the political importance of Ephesus, and which formed such a practical challenge of the truth of his doctrine; lest to have done so should have been taken as a tacit acknowledgment that he was unable to grapple with its different antagonisms, its idolatries, its magic rites, and its philosophies.

We wonder not indeed at his success: for how was it possible that a cause could fail which had for its champion one so devoted, so true of heart, so disinterested, of such intense feelings, and so superior to worldly allurements? How could he

fail to convince all who were not utterly lost to reason and to virtue, who with a majesty all his own could utter those calm but deep and stirring words: 'I take you to record this day 'that I am pure from the blood of all men. I have coveted no 'man's silver or gold, or apparel. Yea, ye yourselves know 'that these hands have ministered unto my necessities and 'to them that were with me?'

But the greatness of the Apostle's gifts and acquirements scarcely takes from the marvel of the briefness of the period in which he accomplished such mighty results. He found the city wholly given up to idolatry; and it is an historical fact, that in the three years of his second visit to it he inflicted a fatal blow on the most elaborate system of heathendom that the world perhaps has ever seen, so that henceforth there was nothing left for it but to languish and die. The very men, it seems, who had grown up in the worship of Diana, passed at once to the service of Christ. The scene on the sea-shore of Miletus shows how deep and thorough was the change at that time, and subsequent history tells us that it was no merely transient conversion, but a deliberate rejection of an old religion, because it was proved to be without heart or grace, and a firm and permanent adoption of another, which possessed all the spiritual power and virtue in which its rival was so entirely deficient.

The remaining history of the Church in Ephesus (on which, in connexion with our subject, it may be allowed us to cast a passing glance) shows that S. Paul had not bestowed on it labour in vain. It is probable, but not certain, that S. Timothy continued Bishop of the city till S. John's arrival thither in the reign of Nerva. S. John gathered around him a few followers, among whom we find numbered some of the greatest names of the period—SS. Ignatius, Polycarp, Papias, Bucolus who with S. John was the instructor of Polycarp, and was his immediate predecessor in the see of Smyrna, Quadratus, and Irenæus. The labours of this devoted band were so successful as to have given rise to the proverb, that 'John had levelled the temple of Diana to the ground.'

After the death of S. John, Onesimus is mentioned by S. Ignatius as Bishop of Ephesus. 'He more than praises,' (*ὑπερεπαινεῖ,*) says S. Ignatius, in his Epistle to the Ephesians, which was written from fifty to sixty years after this visit of S. Paul, 'your good order, your truth, and your freedom from all heresy;' and he mentions their singular obedience to their spiritual governors; their refusal to listen to any teacher but Christ, and their resolutely stopping their ears to the evil doctrines of Satan. In fact, his whole epistle is a panegyric of this Church. Thus, the good which S. Paul began was continued

long after his own course on earth was done; even until the time when, for reasons to us inscrutable, the faith of Christ was allowed to succumb to the apostate rule of the Crescent.

There is a curious liturgical fact connected with the present subject, which, although it appears to have escaped the notice of liturgical scholars, seems to us to be of some moment, as tending to show the date of what are called the primitive liturgies. S. Polycarp was one of the disciples of S. John, and would have been likely to take to Smyrna—if he did not find it there already—the Liturgy, if there were any such, used by the Apostle. There occur twice in the Acts of his Martyrdom what we cannot but regard as Liturgical citations. Firstly, when he was at the stake, he uttered a thanksgiving for being found worthy of bearing testimony to Christ with his life; at the conclusion of which occur some Eucharistic expressions very closely resembling those which in the ancient liturgies follow the Sursum Corda, at the beginning of the Anaphora, and which form part of the Gloria in Excelsis of our own: *Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ περὶ πάντων αἰνῶ σὲ, εὐλογῶ σὲ, δοξάζω σὲ, σὺν τῷ αἰωνίῳ καὶ ἐπουρανίῳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ, ἀγαπητῷ σου παιδί.* With this compare the following words in the Liturgy of S. Mark. *ἀληθῶς γὰρ ἄξιόν ἐστι καὶ δίκαιον ὅσιον τε καὶ πρέπον . . . . σὲ αἰνεῖν, σὲ ὑμνεῖν, σοὶ εὐχαριστεῖν, σοὶ ἀνθομολογεῖσθαι,* and these of that of S. James: *ἀληθῶς ἄξιον ἐστι καὶ δίκαιον πρέπον τε καὶ ὀφειλόμενον, σὲ αἰνεῖν, σὲ ὑμνεῖν, σὲ εὐλογεῖν, σὲ προσκυνεῖν, σὲ δοξολογεῖν, σοὶ εὐχαριστεῖν.* Mr. Palmer quotes from Smith the following words of the hymnus eöthinus of the present Alexandrian Liturgy: *αἰνοῦμεν σὲ, εὐλογοῦμεν σὲ, προσκυνοῦμεν σὲ, δοξολογοῦμεν σὲ, εὐχαριστοῦμεν σοὶ.*[1] Formed on the model of the ancient Liturgies, the passage is identical with our own, 'We praise Thee, we bless Thee, we worship Thee, we glorify Thee, we give thanks to Thee.'

Secondly, the above expressions of S. Polycarp are followed by others, which, again, are almost identical with words continually met with in the ancient Liturgies, and a version of which forms the conclusion of the first prayer in our post Communion Service, *μεθ' οὗ σοὶ καὶ πνεύματι ἁγίῳ ἡ δόξα, καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς τοὺς μέλλοντας αἰῶνας* Ἀμήν.

Lastly, the writer of the Encyclical letter which contains these Acts sends as a salutation to all the Churches, what we cannot but regard as a more full citation of the above words, *ᾧ* (Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ) *ἡ δόξα, τίμη, κράτος, μεγαλοσύνη εἰς αἰῶνας* Ἀμήν. So the Liturgies of S. Mark, S. James, the Clementine, &c. passim; S. Mark, *δι' οὗ καὶ μεθ' οὗ ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος σὺν*

[1] Origines Liturgicæ, vol. ii. p. 159.

τῷ παναγίῳ καὶ ἀγάθῳ καὶ ζωοποιῷ σοῦ πνευμάτι; S. James, ᾧ ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. It is singular that S. Clement of Rome in his first Epistle also frequently repeats words very closely resembling these, and evidently as a portion of some work which was well known to those whom he was addressing: vid. §§ xxi. xxxviii. xliii. xlv. li. lviii. lix. The last especially is so full, and, as appears to us, so unmistakable, that we venture to give it entire: δι' οὗ (Ἰησοῦ Χρίστου) αὐτῷ δόξα, τίμη, κράτος καὶ μεγαλωσύνη, θρόνος αἰώνιος ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων Ἀμήν. Confer also the Clementine Liturgy, held the oldest of all the Liturgies: σοὶ πάσα δόξα, σέβας, καὶ εὐχαρίστια, τιμὴ καὶ προσκύνησις— and our own, 'To whom with Thee and the Holy Ghost be all honour and glory, world without end. Amen.' The whole irresistibly reminds us of S. Paul's parting words to S. Timothy: ᾧ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων Ἀμήν. 2 Tim. iv. 18.

Three conclusions appear to us to be suggested by this remarkable coincidence. Firstly, that the date of the Liturgies, if these are, as seems indisputable, citations from them, is most certainly of the Apostolic age. Secondly, that having been in existence at a time when the Apostles, or most of them, were yet alive, and of such extensive use as from the above extracts we cannot avoid concluding they were, it seems impossible to imagine that they could have had an origin less illustrious than the Apostles themselves. Lastly, the above citations, if they are, as can hardly be questioned, portions of one and the same original document, would apparently lead us to suppose, that, although, exclusively of the Clementine, we speak of four original Liturgies, there was in truth at first, as Bishop Bull for instance supposes, one and one only original Liturgy which was composed for, and in all its most solemn and important parts was used by, the whole Church. The divarications from this form, consisting of alterations of the order of the component parts and a few additions and omissions, were probably the work of those members of the Sacred College whose names the Liturgies now have affixed to them, and were made as the circumstances of their respective Churches required: the Clementine being, as Brett supposes, the closest approximation to the original type *now remaining*. In other words, we suggest that the four Liturgies of Antioch, Alexandria, Rome, and Gaul are not copies of one another, or of the Clementine, or of some other older original which has perished; but in fact and essence *one* original document. The Liturgy of S. James was most probably, we think, in essence the original of the other three, which were taken from it, with such accidental variations of omission and addition as should rather cause them to be termed the *uses* than the Liturgies of

the authors of those variations, S. Peter, S. Mark, and S. John. This Liturgy, S. Clement's citation gives good reason to suppose, was in existence and well known in the middle or latter end of the first century. It is scarcely in the range of possibility, on the one hand, that there was nothing of a Liturgy existing in the Apostolic age; or that, on the other hand, the later compilers, when framing the Liturgies, knew of these words, excerpted them, and welded them into their own productions. To touch a single note is sufficient to show the existence of the instrument; it needs not that the whole tune should be played through. How, except our suggestion or something like it be admitted, could S. Clement, so close a successor of S. Peter at Rome, be using precisely the same words of Eucharistic thanksgiving as were subsequently used by S. Polycarp at Smyrna, an immediate disciple of S. John, neither of the Churches being at all likely to have gone to the other for its Liturgy, or having held, as far as history informs us, any such close mutual correspondence as was carried on, for instance, between the Churches of Gaul and Ephesus in the time of S. Irenæus, and which might have resulted in the Church of Smyrna having in S. Polycarp's time adopted the Liturgy of Rome?

The most interesting and valuable portion of the work before us is perhaps that in which is described the voyage of S. Paul, and his shipwreck on the island of Melita. To the shipping and navigation of the ancients, in all their bearings necessary to the subject, our authors have given full and careful consideration; and in addition to the information, gained by close study of the standard work of Mr. James Smith, and by some MS. notes of the late Admiral Sir Charles Penrose, made from personal inspection, their pages have received, as they inform us, the advantage of high professional opinions. The result is an elaborate and well-written chapter, on a difficult topic, which may be considered as thoroughly exhaustive of its subject.

Among other difficulties on which they have succeeded in throwing light, is the disputed question as to the identity of the island on which the Apostle was wrecked. This we think must now be regarded as settled. Position, navigation, and natural features alike unite in proving both that it could not have been the Melita of the Adriatic Sea now so termed, and that it must have been the present Malta. Let us endeavour to follow our authors in brief outline, in their lucid and comprehensive description of the details of the voyage.

Messrs. Conybeare and Howson commence with a description of the nature of the build and rig of the ships of S. Paul's time. The merchant ships are supposed by them to have varied in tonnage from 500 to 1,000 tons. They were round at both

ends, resembling one of our Thames steamers on a large scale, or a merchant ship cut in two, and the square stern replaced by a round one. On the bows was painted an eye, to which probably S. Luke alludes, xxvii. 15. They were steered by two oar-like rudders, one on each stern quarter, and they had but one mast which was stepped amidships, and carried a large square sail with a long yard, and above that a small topsail. The result of this style of rig would be favourable to the ship's speed when running free, but adverse to it when sailing close-hauled on a wind. Moreover, the strain being confined to the midships, the seams would be liable in bad weather to open, and butts must occasionally have started. Hence each sea-going ship took on board tackling termed *σκεύη κρεμάστα* (words which we can translate neither as standing nor running rigging), which consisted of ropes to be used for 'undergirding' the ship, as our version renders it. These ropes were passed round the hull of a ship that had been strained by bad weather, and drawn tight by a purchase on deck; the object being to keep the ship as water-tight as possible.

A ship so built and rigged could not, in Mr. Smith's opinion, lie nearer the wind when close hauled than seven points, and she would go through the water slowly, and make much leeway; but her large square sail would enable her when going free to make from seven to eight knots an hour, or about 150 or 160 knots in the twenty-four hours. This would in S. Paul's case agree well with the details of the voyage as related by S. Luke.

S. Paul's first ship was, as it appears, a small coasting vessel of Adramyttium, a seaport of Mysia. He embarked about the close of the summer, when the ship was probably bound on her homeward voyage, previously to the closing of the sea, and her being laid up for the winter.[1] She set sail for Cæsarea, and the first place at which she touched was Sidon. Thence with a westerly wind, which was a foul wind for making the south coast of Asia on a straight board from Sidon, which if they could have done they would have left Cyprus on the starboard: they were compelled to steer a NN.W. course, sailing close-hauled till they were well to the north-east of the island, and then beating up through the sea of Cilicia. On this course, the island, when they were to the east of it, would act in a degree as a natural breakwater, and they would also have the benefit of the current

[1] Our classical readers will remember Horace's description of the return of spring, and the opening of the sea, when the ships after their long winter rest were again got into the water:—

'Solvitur acris hyems grata vice veris et Favoni,
Trahuntque siccas machinæ carinas.'—Odes, i. 4.

which runs between Cyprus and the south coast of Asia. Messrs. Conybeare and Howson appear to us in error, when they say at once, that the wind on leaving Sidon was blowing due west, and yet make the ship beat up by short tacks to the north-east point of Cyprus. With the wind from that quarter she could have sailed so far close-hauled; but afterwards her course lay due west, and she would of course have, as they represent, to work to windward, till they made Myra. At this port, the centurion put them on board a corn ship of Alexandria, bound for Rome. She had put into this harbour, as Messrs. Conybeare and Howson suggest, either from stress of the westerly winds experienced by the Apostle and his companions, or for the sake of the current mentioned above, the prevalence of which, as it appears, makes it a common course for ships from Alexandria at that time of year to steer northward towards Asia Minor. This ship contained as we know 270 souls, a number which, in the judgment of Admiral Penrose, as cited by Conybeare and Howson, would have required a craft of about 500 tons burden. The distance of Myra from Cnidus is 130 miles; and the ship, from the wind being foul, took 'many days,' as S. Luke says, to reach the latter port. Had the wind been fair for a straight course to Italy, they would not have gone so far north as Cnidus, but would have steered a wholly different course, passing to the south of the islands of Rhodes and Cevigo, or Cythera, and from thence holding a W.N.W. course to the Straits of Messina. From Cnidus, the wind, blowing from the west or north-west, compelled them to steer to the south. Hence they shaped their course SS.W. which brought them off Cape Salmone, the easternmost point of Crete. This step Messrs. Conybeare and Howson are inclined to think injudicious; they add, however, a note to the effect, that if the words of S. Luke, in which he describes their making Cnidus, *καὶ γενομένοι κατὰ τὴν Κνίδον, μὴ προσεῶντος ἡμᾶς τοῦ ἀνέμου*, mean that the wind did not allow them to enter the harbour, their opinion is erroneous. We prefer the latter view of the case for the following reasons. Firstly, the question seems to be with S. Luke simply confined to Cnidus, and when Admiral Penrose translates his words, 'not suffering them to get on in the direct course,' the words are evidently his own addition. As there is evidently an ellipse, it would appear safer and better to supply it by reference to the subject immediately treated of, rather than to one so far off as that of the course to Italy. Secondly, *pace* Messrs. Conybeare and Howson, the subsequent conduct of the *κυβερνήτης* and crew of the ship, who, as they admit, were sufficiently expert in the navigation of their own seas to avoid a wrong and unseamanlike measure, in sailing to

Crete which had no good harbours open to them, would tend to prove that they could not enter Cnidus, which was an admirable one, 'well sheltered,' as Messrs. Conybeare and Howson describe it, 'from the north-westerly winds, fully supplied with 'all kinds of stores, and in every way commodious, if needful, for 'wintering.' In the event of the wind being foul for their entering that harbour, what better plan could they follow than to do what they did? With the wind from the north-west the island of Crete would have formed a shelter for them, and on the south coast they would have had a weather shore, and an open and calm sea. At Cnidus, they were in danger of being carried back in their course by the northing in the wind, and possibly of being wrecked, either on the small island of Syme, or on the North coast of Rhodes.

From Cape Salmone they could again sail by tacks as far as Fair Havens. Here S. Paul advised that they should winter, for the Fast of Expiation, which was held on the 10th of Tisri, answering to the end of September, or beginning of October, was over, and the sea, to those who have no guides but the sun and stars, was becoming dangerous. But as the harbour was incommodious to winter in, the centurion with the advice of the κυβερνήτης or sailing-master, the ναυκλήρος, or owner, and the crew, determined to weigh and to make sail for the harbour of Phœnice, which was better adapted to the purpose.

The expression of S. Luke, when describing this harbour, βλεπόντα κατὰ λίβα καὶ κατὰ χῶρον, which we translate, 'which lieth toward the south-west and north-west,' has caused much perplexity to commentators, who have supposed that the harbour is commended for lying exposed to those winds, which would have made it in the present instance a dead lee shore, and almost certainly have insured the destruction of the ship. Our authors have offered a suggestion in elucidation of this apparent difficulty, which will assuredly be adopted henceforth by every reader who possesses the slightest knowledge of nautical affairs. They suppose that as S. Luke never actually landed on the spot, he penned his description of it from the advice of the sailors to whom it was familiar, and whom they imagine to speak of it, as seen from their own point of view, that is, from seaward. Thus viewed, the harbour does look in the direction of south-west and north-west; but this position would make it as safe a roadstead as the usual idea of it, which seems to have arisen simply from our translators having rendered βλέποντα by 'which lieth,' would make it perilous. In a bay which looked to the north-west and south-west from seaward the ship would no longer be on a lee shore. To the south-west also a tongue of land, as laid down in Messrs. Conybeare and

Howson's chart of this part of the coast, would form an effectual breakwater to the ship, inside which she would have by comparison scarcely any wind and little or no sea. Our authors have offered reasons for concluding the modern harbour of Lutro to be identical with the ancient Phœnice. If they are correct (and there seems to our mind to be no doubt that they are so), the words of S. Luke have received a wonderful confirmation from the description of the harbour by its present health officer, whose words are cited by Messrs. Conybeare and Howson :—

'Though the harbour,' he says, 'is open to the east, yet the easterly gales never blow home, being lifted by the high land behind, and even in storms the sea rolls in gently. So that it is the only secure harbour in all winds on the south coast of Crete.'

But the sudden springing up of the Euroclydon, or Euroquila, for the reading is doubtful, baffled the efforts of the crew to make this harbour. Admiral Penrose and Mr. Smith are slightly at variance as to the exact quarter from which this wind blew. The admiral thinks that it was at first due north, and afterwards veered round to east, at which point it continued, varying occasionally a point or two to north or east. Mr. Smith, with whom Messrs. Conybeare and Howson agree, is of opinion that it was E.N.E. 'Non nostrum tantas.' The result was that the ship was obliged to scud before it until she had gained the lee of the small island of Claudia. This afforded her a comparatively smooth sea for about twelve or fifteen miles, of which the crew took advantage to get the boat on board from towing astern, and so to apply their undergirders.

The first thing the crew had now to do was to make the ship snug for foul weather. This S. Luke has described in the seventeenth verse of the twenty-seventh chapter, in the words χαλασάντες τὸ σκεῦος, which our version renders 'strake sail,' and which Conybeare and Howson understand to mean that they lowered the gear, either reefing and setting the mainsail, or lowering the mainyard on deck, and hoisting a small storm-sail. They did not suffer the ship simply to drive before the wind, as our version would seem to imply, because to have done this would have been to insure their being driven on the Syrtis, the very result they dreaded. The authorities all agree that the ship must have been hove-to on the starboard tack, *i.e.* with the right side to the wind, with her head pointed to westward. In this way she would drift away from the shoals at the rate, says Admiral Penrose, of about a mile and a half an hour, or thirty-six miles in the twenty-four hours, and her course would be west by north. In this condition they drifted up and down the sea between Crete and Malta, then called the Adriatic, until at last, on the fourteenth day, they ran the ship on the island of Malta.

It only now remains (and our rapidly diminishing space warns us to be brief) that we state our grounds for concluding that the island on which S. Paul was wrecked was Malta. The arguments of those who maintain that it was Meleda, in the Adriatic Gulf, chiefly turn on the natural and accidental features of the place, as described by S. Luke, which they assert to agree closely with those of Meleda, but to be wholly at variance with all we know of Malta. They say, for instance, that there are no serpents in Malta, whilst Meleda abounds with them; that there was scarcely any wood on Malta; that the sailors did not know the island when the day broke, which it is assumed they must have done had it been Malta; and that the natives are called barbarians, a term wholly unsuited to the Maltese, who were a highly civilized people, but applicable to the inhabitants of Meleda. (Coleridge's 'Table Talk,' quoted by Conybeare and Howson.)

The answer to most of these objections lies on the surface. The lapse of ages and the advance of civilization are causes more than sufficient to account for such changes in the natural features of Malta as have taken place since S. Paul's visit. The sailors did recognise the spot as soon as they landed; and as to the application to the inhabitants of the term barbarian, it is most probable, as Conybeare and Howson suggest, that the crew of the ship were Greeks, and that S. Luke followed their custom as such, of so describing all who spoke a language different to their own.

The arguments of Admiral Penrose and Mr. Smith, on the other side of the question, derived from personal acquaintance with the place and nautical knowledge combined, are by no means to be disposed of so easily.

'If Euroclydon,' says the former, 'blew in such a direction as to make the pilots afraid of being driven on the quicksands (and there were no such dangers but to the south-west of them), how could it be supposed that they were driven north towards the Adriatic? In truth, it is very difficult for a well-appointed ship of modern days to get from Crete into and up the Adriatic, at the season named in the narrative, the north winds being then prevalent, and strong. We find the ship certainly driven from the south coast of Crete, from the Fair Havens towards Clauda (now Gozzi), on the south-west, and during the fourteen days' continuance of the gale, we are never told that Euroclydon ceased to blow, and with either a Gregalia or Levanter blowing hard, S. Paul's ship could not possibly have proceeded up the Adriatic.—How is it possible that a ship at that time, and so circumstanced, could have got up the difficult navigation of the Adriatic? To have *drifted* up the Adriatic to the island of Melita or Melida, in the requisite curve, and to have passed so many islands, and other dangers in the route, would, humanly speaking, have been impossible. The distance from Clauda to this Melita is not less than 780 geographical miles, and the wind must have long been from the south to make this voyage in fourteen days. Now, from Clauda to Malta there is

not any one danger in a direct line, and we see that the distance and direction of drift will both agree.'—Note 6, p. 428.

With this compare the following very interesting observations of Mr. Smith:—

'Now, with respect to the distance, allowing the degree of strength of the gale to vary a little occasionally, I consider that a ship would drift at the rate of about one mile and a half per hour, which, at the end of fourteen complete days, would amount to 504 miles, but it does not appear that the calculation is to be made for fourteen entire days; it was on the fourteenth night the anchors were cast off the shores of Melita. The distance from the south of Clauda to the north of Malta, measured on the best chart I have, is about 490 miles; and is it possible for coincident calculations of such a nature to be more exact? In fact, on one chart, after I had calculated the supposed drift, as a seaman, to be 504 miles, I measured the distance to be 503.'—P. 416, note 2.

In addition to these, we will venture to borrow an extract from Messrs. Conybeare and Howson:—

'In the first place, we are told that they became aware of land *by the presence of breakers, and yet without striking*. Now, an inspection of the chart will show us that a ship drifting west by north might approach Koura point, the eastern boundary of S. Paul's bay, without having fallen in previously with any other part of the coast; for, towards the neighbourhood of Valetta, the shore trends rapidly to the southward. Again, the character of this point, as described in the sailing directions, is such that there must infallibly have been violent breakers upon it that night. Yet a vessel drifting west by north might pass it, within a quarter of a mile, without striking on the rocks. But what are the soundings at this point? They are now *twenty fathoms*. If we proceed a little farther, we find *fifteen fathoms*. It may be said that this, in itself, is nothing remarkable. But if we add, that the fifteen-fathom depth is *in the direction of the vessel's drift* (west by north) from the twenty-fathom depth, the coincidence is startling. But at this point we observe, on looking at the chart, that now there would be *breakers ahead*, and yet at such a distance ahead, that there would be *time for the vessel to anchor*, before actually striking on the rocks. All these conditions must necessarily be fulfilled; and we see that they are fulfilled without any attempt at ingenious explanation. But we may proceed farther. The character of the coast on the farther side of the bay is such, that though the greater part of it is fronted with mural precipices, there are one or two indentations, which exhibit the appearance of "*a creek with a* [*sandy or pebbly*] *shore*." And again we observe that the island of Salmonetta is so placed that the sailors, looking from the deck when the vessel was at anchor, could not possibly be aware that it was not a continuous part of the mainland; whereas, while they were running her aground, they could not help observing the opening of the channel, which would thus appear (like the Bosphorus) "*a place between two seas*," and would be more likely to attract their attention, if some current resulting from this juxtaposition of the island and the coast interfered with the accuracy of their steering. And finally, to revert to the fact of the anchors holding through the night (a result which could not confidently be predicted), we find it stated in our English Sailing Directions, that the ground in S. Paul's Bay is so good, that "while the cables hold, there is no danger, as the anchors will never start."'—Vol. ii. pp. 421, 422, 423.

There are a few other subjects on which we should have wished to say something had time and space allowed. We had especially noted for observation some points of questionable scholarship in the translation by our authors of St. Paul's Epistles. As it is, we must content ourselves with only noticing further the Chapter and Appendix, in which Messrs. Conybeare and Howson discuss the origin of the heresies of the Apostolic Age: whether it were Jewish, heathen, or a mixture of both.

The conclusion at which they arrive is very much the same as that of most of the historians who have formally and scientifically discussed the point. They consider them to have been a mixture of Gnosticism and Judaism. This is, in the main, the opinion for which we have contended more than once in these pages. It appears to us to be no abstract question, but one touching a matter of fact, and capable of a practical answer from history. Who were the heresiarchs of that period, and what were their opinions? Let them be called up and speak for themselves. On the Jewish side, the leading opponents of the Gospel were Cerinthus, Carpocrates, Ebion and the Ebionites, the Nazarenes, and the Nicolaitans. On the heathen, Simon (Magus) and his followers, Menander, Basilides, and Saturnilus, or Saturninus.[1]

It is no doubt the fact that these different classes, diverging widely from each other on some particular subjects, such as the unity or plurality of the Godhead, and the nature of the Creator of the world, joined hands on others, so as to appear, to a superficial observer, of one and the same class; but it is certain that the Jewish and heathen did exist as separate classes of heretics. Cerinthus is most commonly considered as the leader of the former: Simon Magus of the latter.

Cerinthus and Carpocrates were so nearly equal in time, that it is quite impossible to decide which of the two were the earlier as a teacher of anti-Christian doctrine. S. Epiphanius, Eusebius, Philaster, Theodoret, and, in a word, the ancients generally, are almost unanimous in placing Cerinthus after Carpocrates; and S. Epiphanius especially says, that Cerinthus came from Carpocrates, and taught little but what Carpocrates had done before. According to Eusebius, Cerinthus was a contemporary of Ebion and the Ebionites, and lived in the time of

[1] Our authorities for the following statements are the writers of greatest weight, ancient and modern, who have treated of the subject: S. Irenæus, Tertullian, Eusebius, S. Epiphanius, Theodoret, S. Augustin, Philaster, Baronius, Buddæus, Brucker, Burton, Colberg, Ittigius, Mosheim, in his De rebus, and greater Institutes, Waterland, &c. It would be needless to refer to each of them, as we might do, for every particular statement.

Hadrian; and we are told by S. Irenæus, that his doctrines had been taught before him by Nicolas and the Nicolaitanes. The moderns, for the most part, reverse this order. Cerinthus was said to have been the author of those dissensions with regard to the necessity of the law, which led to the Council of Jerusalem. He was educated in Alexandria, and hence, as a Jew, he acknowledged one God, and hence, Burton thinks that he derived his heretical principles on the Creation; viz., that the world was the work of an evil angel or æon; and Mosheim (in his greater *Institutes*), that he added Gnosticism to Judaism. His doctrines on Christ were similar to those of Ebion, Carpocrates, and the Nazarenes. He denied that Jesus was Christ, and thought him simply the son of Joseph and Mary, and that Christ—that is the Holy Ghost—came into him at baptism in the form of a dove, and revealed to him the Father. On Jesus, therefore, he taught Psilanthropism, and on Christ Division. He differed essentially and irreconcilably from the Gnostics in acknowledging the resurrection of the body; though he denied that of Christ to have taken place and affirmed it to be future; from Carpocrates in requiring the law; and from the Jews in general in confessing two Gods. From Alexandria he travelled northwards, and taught in Jerusalem, Cæsarea, Antioch, and Asia. St. Cyril, of Jerusalem, called him "the ravager of the Church." According to S. Augustin, he taught the necessity of the observance of the law; not *ex animo,* for he called both the law itself and its giver evil, but to avoid persecution (*i.e.* by belonging to a legalized religion, which Judaism was, but which Christianity was not); and S. Augustin would seem to be confirmed in his statement by the fact that although his followers taught the need of circumcision for others, they remained uncircumcised themselves.

With him, whether actually preceding or following him in time, we must place Carpocrates. Like Cerinthus, he also was by birth and education an inhabitant of Alexandria. He too, as S. Irenæus and Theodoret say, taught pure Psilanthropism. He held the existence of only one ἀρχὴ, but many æon creators, and with Eusebius and S. Epiphanius he has the reputation of having been one of the original founders of Gnosticism. Unlike Cerinthus, he denied the necessity or obligation of the law, and the resurrection of the body. He dealt in magic incantations, interpretations of dreams, and other like supposed means of correspondence with the unseen powers, which were the general mark and practice of the Gnostics of this age. S. Irenæus and S. Epiphanius say that his followers were of the lowest and most revoltingly immoral class of anti-Evangelists, in which again he differed from Cerinthus; and

Tertullian calls him a fornicator. Eusebius says that Irenæus made him a contemporary of Menander, Saturninus, and Basilides, the followers of Simon Magus.

Ebion agreed, says Irenæus, with Cerinthus, that the world was created by God (but here S. Irenæus contradicts himself), and they rejected S. Paul because they considered him an apostate from the law. They practised circumcision, kept the law, and worshipped at Jerusalem, considering the Temple as Domus Dei.

With regard to their time, the ancients are pretty well agreed. Eusebius says they were contemporary with Menander, and Cerinthus; Tertullian, and Theodoret who makes them to be the chief heretics of the time of the apostles, that they succeeded Cerinthus; S. Epiphanius, that they followed the Nazarenes, who followed Cerinthus. Mosheim thinks that the Ebionites lived in the first century, but were not known as heretical teachers till the second; and Burton suggests that they were the same as the Nazarenes. Ittigius mentions a tradition that the Apostle Philip was their chief opponent, and put an end to their heresy. In their doctrines they were Psilanthropists, and hence they rejected the genealogy of Christ in the Gospel of S. Matthew, and taught, like Cerinthus, division between Jesus and Christ, and the coming of Christ, or the Holy Ghost, on Jesus. Another class of them held a phantasiastic doctrine of the body of Christ, denying that he had a substantial body and real human nature. Others of them held, like Carpocrates and Cerinthus, that the Sonship of Christ was not by nature, but by personal virtue and election (an idea which Airius and his followers seem to have borrowed from them); and they practised circumcision.

The Nazarenes were also (of course) Jews, and of the same period. S. Epiphanius places them generally at the same time as the Cerinthians, and so do Eusebius, Theodoret, and S. Augustin. They lived at Pella, whence they betook themselves after the taking of Jerusalem. S. Epiphanius describes them as being neither Jews, because they believed in Jesus Christ, nor Christians because they kept Sabbaths, and practised circumcision; and so S. Jerome. They joined themselves to the Ebionites, and seem to have differed, as Jews would, from the Cerinthians on the creation of the world. Neander says that they did not, like other Judaizing Christians, teach division between Jesus and Christ.

The history of Nicolas and the Nicolaitanes, or Balaamites, is too slight to enable us to say much of them. They are thought by S. Irenæus, S. Augustin, and the ancients generally, and by Buddæus, Tillemont, Mosheim, Burton, and others

among the moderns, to have been the followers of Nicolas the deacon, but to have perverted his doctrine of continence to the opposite extreme of unlimited abuse and indulgence. Eusebius says that in time they were contemporary with Cerinthus and the Ebionites; and S. Irenæus, that Nicolas was the master of Cerinthus. S. Epiphanius and Philaster consider that Nicolas was the leader and source of the γνῶσις of the Gnostics; and the former connects them very closely with Simon Magus and his followers, and considers them polytheists. Their custom of eating idol sacrifices would tend, as Messrs. Conybeare and Howson say, to separate them from Jews, and to unite them with heathens. Their doctrine of æons and their other Gentile customs alluded to by S. Augustin, we may add, point to the same conclusion; but if they were indeed the followers of the deacon, it is probable that they may have had some Jewish leaven in them, though united with particular anti-Judaic customs and doctrines.

The opinions of Simon Magus are better known. He was always termed by the early writers the father of (heathen) heresy. He had as his master Dositheus, a Samaritan; but with him we have, at present, nothing to do. Simon has been described by Mosheim, Brucker, and others, and unquestionably with correctness, in the twofold character of a philosopher explaining abstract questions, and of a teacher of a new religion that was to bring men to eternal happiness.

His system was composed of Chaldæan, Persian, and Egyptian doctrines; accordingly, we find that he held the eternity of matter, the existence of æons, dualism, and that the Creator (or, as some say, matter) was the evil principle, and the cause of evil. He denied the resurrection of the body, as he considered it the creation of the evil power. He pretended either to be, or to possess in a remarkable degree, the power of the supreme God, by which he claimed to set aside the Scriptures of the Prophets, affirming himself to have fulfilled and therefore abrogated them. He practised magic, allowed idolatry, and taught the doctrine of metempsychosis. In fact, he was an enemy and destroyer of Christianity; and he did not, like the Jews, unite it with the law. Simon's followers in the first century, were Menander, Basilides, and Saturnilus; but as, in all main points, their opinions coincided with those of their master, it is needless to repeat them.

Here, then, we have two separate and distinct sources and lines of heresy in the apostolic age: a Jewish and a heathen one. Each of these antagonistic systems held particular doctrines, that were peculiar to itself, and served at once to mark

it off from the others. Yet, on minor points, it cannot be questioned that (as we have said before) they joined hands. Thus Cerinthus agreed with Simon Magus, in asserting that Christ, the æon, came on Jesus at his baptism; and with the Jews, in keeping the law. In fact, Gnosticism was composed of two elements: Docetism, which asserted that Christ suffered only in appearance; and Division, which distinguished essentially between Jesus and Christ. Simon was the author of the former, and Cerinthus of the latter; and thus Cerinthus was, in fact, the connecting link between Jewish and Gnostic heresy.

P.S.—A contemporary (the *Literary Churchman*), in a late number, blames Messrs. Conybeare and Howson for adopting the conclusion, that the Epistle to the Ephesians was not originally written and addressed exclusively to that Church; but, as Archbishop Usher thinks, was an encyclical letter addressed to several Churches. We agree with our contemporary, that the conclusion of Messrs. Conybeare and Howson cannot stand; but we did not notice the point in our article, because the last word does not lie with them. Their reasoning has been carefully sifted and conclusively answered by Dean Alford in his prolegomena to the Epistle, to which it is sufficient to refer our readers. To go over the ground again would be simply *actum agere*.

ART. II.—*Memoirs, Letters, and Speeches of Anthony Ashley Cooper, First Earl of Shaftesbury, Lord Chancellor, with other Papers illustrating his Life, from his Birth to the Restoration.* Edited by WILLIAM DOUGAL CHRISTIE, Esq. her Majesty's Envoy Extraordinary, and Minister Plenipotentiary in Brazil. London: John Murray, Albemarle Street. 1859.

EVERY one knows that Anthony Ashley Cooper, Earl of Shaftesbury, owns a letter in the word 'Cabal,' and was the author of the Habeas Corpus Act. Many persons, too, are aware of the existence of some connexion between him and a volume on ethical philosophy, called 'The Characteristics;' and some, including the accomplished authoress of 'Uncle Tom's Cabin,' are even persuaded that the statesman and the philosopher are one. In addition to this very slender basis of facts, whether true or false, the world has chosen to construct for itself a compendious theory of his general character as made up of low cunning, vice, hypocrisy, and rashness, which seems, from its apparent consistency and completeness, to supersede the necessity of entering more laboriously into particulars. Other volumes on Shaftesbury's life will, we hope, follow from Mr. Christie's pen, with somewhat more of the biographical cement in them than the present possesses. But we ought to feel grateful to him for having first set out the meagre array of the certain facts, on which, if on anything, must rest the conclusion, in which most historians have already acquiesced, that this celebrated statesman was nothing but a sordid political trickster.

It is generally acknowledged that the period succeeding that of the Great Rebellion is the blackest blot on our annals; and this, in the face of the recognition of the fact, that, in that age, the condition of things under which we now live, practically commenced. That broad level space in our history, which the rule of Charles II. covers, was formed, as it were, of the *débris* from the wrought-up feeling of the preceding epoch: and the constitution developed itself fast in that period under the influence and impetus descending from the previous one. But it was as with the Campagna, or with Lombardy; the abundance of nutrition produced malaria, on which bad and selfish counsels fattened; and we, to whom the better qualities of that area in our history are so entirely the air we breathe, that we often fail to see anything remarkable in that which is

become habitual to us, and, in fact, a negative condition of existence, are thereby made the keener at distinguishing every worse current in the atmosphere which overspreads it.

No one of that generation has been so universally stigmatized as of the band of men who dammed up into a stagnant dangerous pool, to serve their own mean purposes, the nobler impulses of the two parties of the immediately preceding epoch, as the hero of Mr. Christie's work. We have accepted as a foregone conclusion the Court-poet Dryden's magnificent onslaught on the popular champion. The results of his exertions have been imputed to him for demonstrations of his worldliness, as proofs that he was even so utterly without shame, as to pervert enthusiasm to the gratification of personal vindictiveness. The Whigs themselves have, in the person of Lord Campbell, disclaimed his advocacy of their cause, repudiating the author of their party, as the general does a deserter through whom he has gained a victory. Against all such hypotheses and assumptions a protest has been despatched from the tropical jungles of Brazil, a formal negation, and even an assertion, in the Earl's favour, of constant political consistency, founded on what must ever be the best of all authorities, if sufficiently numerous, and capable of being tested by independent evidence—viz. the man's own words and self-recorded acts.

These materials for a confutation of the vulgar opinion are of three kinds—1, fragments of autobiography; 2, some originally suppressed passages of General Ludlow's 'Diary;' and 3, notices of proceedings before the Council of State, and of Shaftesbury's own speeches in Parliament during the Commonwealth.

The first fragment of autobiography (1621-1639,) commences with the apology, that 'the villanous slander, dispersed about him, under the authority of both Church and State, have forced him to follow the French fashion,' and write his own memoirs. He then proceeds to give an account of his youth and position in the country. His name of Ashley and the manor of Wimborne St. Giles he got from his mother's father, a comrade of the first Devereux Earl of Essex, and original planter of cabbage, in England; with Hampshire he was connected through his father, Sir John Cooper, who gave him for stepmother, 'a co-heiress of Lord Camden's, a discreet woman of a large soul, who gave some jealousy to both her husbands.' A German doctor took his horoscope at his birth, and his boyhood was tended by a Mr. Guerden, chosen for his severe principles, not borne out by practice, by old Sir Anthony Ashley, the grandfather, the latter thinking 'a youth could 'not have too deep a dye of religion, for business and conversa-

'tion in the world wear it *to a just moderation*"—a terrible theory when combined with the spectacle of a father who was a great gambler. On Sir John Cooper's death, he came under the guardianship of one Sir Daniel Norton, and had to fight his way against a host of his father's creditors, who strove to make the estate liable to their demands. His only ally was the famous black-letter lawyer, Noy, the discoverer or inventor of Ship-money, while, on the other side, were men powerful enough to get themselves appointed by the Court of Wards commissioners to conduct the sale of lands, which they were themselves intending to purchase. His subsequent acuteness in detecting flaws in the new owners' titles enabled him later to retaliate on these freebooters, at whose head were his great uncle, Sir Francis Ashley, and 'old Mr. Tregonwell, who 'never knew generosity or kindness but for himself, his horse, 'or his dog.' Meantime, he made the prosecution an excuse to his own affections for eluding his hostess Lady Norton's proffer of the hand of her youngest, and probably portionless, daughter, with whom he seems to have been in danger, but for his precocious prudence, of falling in love. A young gentleman of fourteen, who could act with so much sageness as, though possessed of a large estate, to decline an alliance which would not have increased it, must have had something remarkable in his disposition. At Oxford, whither he now went, he soon, we are told by himself, became popular among the seniors by his learning and affability, and among his contemporaries, as well by 'letting his name in the buttery book own twice the expense of any in the University,' as by leading the *coursing*, originally, he says, a competition in logic and metaphysics, but latterly in strength of hissing and jostling between Christ Church and the tall raw-boned Cornish and Devonshire men of Exeter College. His authority, puny and weak as he was, he upheld by generously ransoming his guards, when they had been caught in the act of stealing a neighbouring farmer's poultry. Nor this only; he also glories in having stopped a threatened diminution of the size of the college beer (wisely and kindly warning all those who had to live by their studies to keep quiet, while he and all the elder brothers in the college menaced secession); and still more, in putting down 'that ill custom of tucking freshmen,' which, for the benefit of all thorough Conservatives and opponents of reform in schools, we had better relate in the embryo statesman's own words:—

'The first (the custom of tucking) was a harder work, it having been a foolish custom of great antiquity, that one of the seniors in the evening called the freshmen to the fire, and made them hold out their chin; and they, with the nail of their right thumb, kept long for that purpose, grate off all the skin

from the lip to the chin, and then cause them to drink a beer-glass of water and salt. The time approaching when I should be thus used, I considered that it had happened in that year' (observe his caution!) 'more and lustier young gentlemen had come to the college than had done in several years before, and that the freshmen were a very strong body. Upon this, I consulted my two cousins-german, both freshmen, both stout and very strong, and several others; and, at last, the whole party were cheerfully engaged to stand stoutly to defence of their chins. We all appeared in the hall, and my Lord of Pembroke's son calling me first, I, according to agreement, gave the signal, striking him a box on the ear, and immediately the freshmen fell on and we easily cleared the buttery and the hall; but bachelors and young masters coming in to assist the seniors, we were compelled to retreat to a ground chamber in the quadrangle. They pressing at the door, some of the stoutest and strongest of our freshmen, giantlike boys, opened the doors, let in as many as they pleased, and shut the door by main strength against the rest; those let in they fell upon, and had beaten very severely, but that my authority with them stopped them, some of them being considerable enough to make terms for us, which they did, for Dr. Prideaux being called out to suppress the mutiny, the old doctor, always favourable to youth offending out of courage, wishing with the fears of those we had within, gave us articles of pardon for what had passed, and an utter abolition in that college of that foolish custom.'

The peculiar combination in Shaftesbury, which the above anecdote shows, of prudence with boldness, both in calculating means and in using a victory, followed him outside the walls of Oxford. Not even the counsels of his friend Olivian, the astronomer, could make him act on predictions, the accomplishment of which he regretfully narrates, of the fortune which was to fall to a Miss Banister. He preferred to such contingencies the certainties of a connexion with the powerful Lord Keeper Coventry, and was accepted as a suitor for the hand of one of that great man's daughters, the 'prudence of the lady' inducing her to overlook the odd phenomenon that her lover, in the nervousness doubtless of affection, had talked much more agreeably to her sister than herself. The alliance seems to have increased his influence in his own neighbourhood, and when released from attendance on his father-in-law at the mansion in the Strand, and the country villa of Canonbury, famous as both Queen Elizabeth's and Oliver Goldsmith's residence, he could vie, not unsuccessfully, with the stiff grandeur of a rival squire, Rogers, and his coach and six, at the Dorsetshire bowling-greens. It was, indeed, to a complete overthrow of that unhistorical magnate's predominance in the county that all his emotions and hopes at this time pointed; and soon a faction gathered about him, the leading idea in which was jealousy of Mr. Rogers. There was found Sir Walter Earl, an old campaigner, who, like Uncle Toby, cut his garden into copies of the redoubts he had stormed and defended in the Low Countries; John Tregonwell, who, with his 'night-caps,' which we conjecture must have had some relation to Punch, 'and his poached

eggs, thought no farther of the world,' or perhaps of the iniquities of Mr. Rogers; Lord Digby, well known to all students of Clarendon, and then as subsequently 'justly 'admired by all, but disadvantaged by a pedantic stiffness and 'affectation;' niggardly Sir John Strangwaies, and cunning Mr. Gray, Colonel Brigham, and Sir John Trenchard. Alike sagacious politicians like Holles, and old-fashioned country gentlemen seem to have been studied by him, in relation to the all-engrossing topic of his neighbour's 'malicious rivalry.' That the young gentleman must have been versatile even at this early period of his life is proved by his influence, at the same time, with courtiers, and with squires of the stamp of Mr. Hastings, of whom we read the following inimitable sketch in the autobiography:—

'He was a man low, very strong, and very active, of a reddish flaxen hair, his clothes always green cloth, and were all worth when new five pounds. His house was perfectly of the old fashion, in the midst of a large park well stocked with deer, and, near the house, rabbits to serve his kitchen, many fish ponds, and great store of wood and timber; a bowling-green in it long but narrow, full of high ridges, it being never levelled since it was ploughed; they used round sand bowls, and it had a banqueting house like a stand, a large one built in a tree. He kept all manner of sport hounds that ran, buck, fox, hare, otter, and badger, and hawks long and short-winged; he had all sorts of nets for fishing; he had a walk in the New Forest and the manor of Christ Church. This last supplied him with red deer, sea and river fish; and, indeed, all his neighbour's grounds and royalties were free to him. . . . . Every yeoman round was 'very welcome to his house whenever he came; there he found beef, pudding and small beer in great plenty; a house not so neatly kept as to shame him of his dirty shoes, the great hall strewed with marrow-bones, full of hawks' perches, hounds, spaniels, and terriers, the upper side of the hall hung with the fox-skins of this and the last year's skinning, here and there a pole-cat intermixed, guns, and keepers' and huntsmen's poles in abundance. The parlour was a large room as properly furnished; on a great hearth paved with brick lay some terriers and the choicest hounds and spaniels; seldom but two of the great chairs had litters of young cats in them, which were not to be disturbed, he having always three or four attending him at dinner, and a little white round stick of fourteen inches long lying by his trencher, that he might defend such meat as he had no mind to part with to them. The windows, which were very large, served for places to lay his arrows, crossbows, stonebows, and other such like accoutrements; the corners of the room full of the best chase, hunting, and hawking poles; an oyster table at the lower end, which was of constant use twice a-day all the year round, for he never failed to eat oysters before dinner and supper through all seasons. The neighbouring town of Poole supplied him with them. The upper part of this room had two small tables and a desk, on the one side of which was a church Bible, on the other the Book of Martyrs; on the tables were hawks' hoods, bells, and such like, two or three old green hats with their crowns thrust in, so as to hold ten or a dozen eggs, which were of a pheasant kind of poultry he took much care of, and fed himself; tables, dice, cards, and boxes were not wanting. In the hole of the desk were store of tobacco pipes that had been used. On one side of this end of the room was the door of a closet wherein stood the strong beer and the wine, which never came thence but in single glasses, that being the rule of the house exactly observed, for he never exceeded in drink or permitted it.

On the other side was a door into an old chapel, not used for devotion; the pulpit, as the safest place, was never wanting of a cold chine of beef, pasty of venison, gammon of bacon, or great apple pie with thick crust extremely baked. His table cost him not much, though it was very good to eat at, his sport supplying all but beef and mutton, except Friday, when he had the best sea-fish, as well as other fish the best he could get, and was the day that his neighbours of best family visited him. He never wanted a London pudding, and always sang it in with "My part lies therein-a." He drank a glass of wine or two at meals, very often syrup of gillyflower in his sack, and had always a tun glass without feet stood by him, holding a pint of small beer, which he often stirred with a great sprig of rosemary. He was well-natured, but soon angry. . . . . He lived to be a hundred, never lost his eyesight, but read without spectacles and got to horse without help. Until past fourscore he rode to the death of a stag as well as any.'

Such was a son, brother, and uncle to the Earls of Huntingdon, 'a copy of our nobility in ancient days, in hunting and not warlike times.' The type has been represented in our own times by the late Sir Richard Sutton: Mr. Assheton Smith's friends would, we presume, repudiate any such comparison for him.

Young Sir Anthony's acquaintances seem not to have been confined to Hampshire and Dorset, for even in Somerset he had many intimates, among them that 'cunning crafty old fox, Lord Pawlett.' Everywhere indeed, as at all stages of his life, he made friends—and, perhaps too, enemies; for the 'pleasant lazy humour,' which made him, though, and even while subject to dreadful pain in the side, 'hate pitying, and laugh and joke when the drops fell from his face for agony,' was always ready for a rivalry. It was not so much a love of power and grandeur which moved him, as a passion for being the first in his company, and a burning craving to be conspicuous. For some time, indeed, he does not seem to have let his desire for shining roam beyond his own immediate circle; it was to influence that alone that he used his accomplishments, among which he reckons his skill in palmistry and telling fortunes, and the acquaintance with family secrets, which he procured through the cleverness of a favourite servant. But an accidental visit to Tewkesbury, and the gratitude of the bailiffs of that town for his retorting upon the bitter-tempered old Sir Harry Spiller, the taunts the latter had thrown out against the corporation at a civic dinner, procured him a seat in the Short Parliament of 1640, 'without a penny charge.' Here, when thus launched in public life, and in the midst of an account, not too accurate, of the Reformation and its political consequences, the first autobiographical sketch leaves us, not inconsolable, since the whirl of public affairs would certainly have forbidden his making the conclusion of the memoir a receptacle for pleasant scandal about his rural neighbours.

His next contribution towards his own biography overlaps the other, being a narrative of his life from 1621 to 1650. In the Long Parliament, he claimed to sit for Downton, but was excluded, till Richard Cromwell's deposition, by a party manœuvre, the House not requiring the return of the Committee's report, which was in favour of his election. In consequence, perhaps, of this, though possibly it was the suspicion of his Royalism which had caused the delay, he accepted a commission for the capture of Weymouth and of Dorchester, which had long been under the sway of 'their parson, Mr. White, one of the wisest and subtlest of that sort of men.' He succeeded in the undertaking, and was rewarded by being nominated Governor of Weymouth and other places, by Lord Hertford, the King's lieutenant in the south-western districts. He even kept the appointment, though Prince Maurice would have dismissed him in favour of a friend of his own; and Mr. Christie stoutly denies that his subsequent resignation was at all compulsory. It is, however, supposed that his original retention of the post was the result of a compromise between the Prince and Hertford, and if so, Shaftesbury's enemies may assert, with some plausibility, that chagrin at having the duration of his dignity limited may have had something to do with the sudden defection to the Parliamentary side which he soon after accomplished. He himself appeals to the fact, that Charles had promised him a barony, and that he left all his estate at the mercy of the Royalist army, in proof that the change is attributable simply to the discovery, that Charles's aims were 'destructive to religion and the State.' Yet it would have been, at all events, satisfactory, had he intimated, however slightly, what were the special new signs of this which had been revealed to him in the very short period since he took up arms for the King.

After his secession, according to his own account, and there is no reason to doubt the details—though, if every other action in the Civil Wars were detailed in the same way, his exploits would probably appear minutiæ—he displayed great generalship, both in his own and the neighbouring counties. He raised sieges, —taking, for instance, part in the relief of the gallant Blake at Taunton—took castles, and achieved other glorious exploits, he intimates, in all departments of war. And this, too, along with a remarkably close connexion with the ordinary amenities of a peaceable life. Sometimes a black spot meets the eye, showing that war must be war, whoever wages it; as when he tells us that, on the besieged at Amesbury crying out for quarter, he, 'considering how many garrisons of the same nature we were to 'deal with, gave command there should be none given; but they 'should be kept into the house, that they and their garrison might

'fall together.' But generally, people seem to have thought and acted, when away from the immediate scene of hostilities, much as at any other time. Thus, in the midst of his splendid campaigns, he could find time to go with his wife, and drink the waters at Tunbridge for six weeks, besides paying visits to connexions, spending whole summer days in bowling-greens, sojourning in lodgings in Holborn for the transacting of business, such as the letting of houses in the neighbouring Ely Rents, or the borrowing of money for the liquidation of various small debts, or the purposes of his Barbadoes property; for he seems to have loved speculating with money, as well as with bills and motions in Parliament. Then, again, we hear of this warrior, statesman, man of pleasure, man of business, at Dorchester, not, perhaps, condemning, but certainly confessing, to a conviction of the guilt of the accused, when the body of the murdered bled at the man's touch, and sentencing to 'death pressed soldiers that ran away of the 15th of January, 1646,' while his upright fellow-magistrate and himself suffer the lives of 'men who had been faithful soldiers to the State to be begged,' spite of their crimes. Nor does he suffer the fact of his high position in his county to remain in obscurity. He had been appointed by the King to the office of Sheriff while yet a Royalist; and, in 1647, he was serving the Parliament in that post; he talks proudly of his 'sixty men in liveries to receive the judges,' and of 'the ordinary kept for all gentlemen, at Lawes's, at 4*s.* a head; I paid for all.' So, in the following years, his name appears in connexion with divers provincial employments, which show the high consideration he enjoyed. They were interrupted in 1649 by the death of his wife, whom he affectionately eulogizes, as well for many noble qualities, as for 'preserving, works with the needle, cookery, so that her wit and judgment were expressed in all things.' But from this same year, when the war ended with the King's death, about which the diary keeps entire silence, his ambition began to take a wider range. We see that this was the case from the references to him in certain passages of the 'Memoirs of Ludlow,' the conqueror of Ireland and exile of Vevey. These fragments were discovered by Mr. Christie among the 'Locke Papers,' having been suppressed, at the publication of the 'Memoirs' in 1698, by the writer's Whig friends, who fancied that the great liberal champion's character might be damaged by the insinuations of the Republican soldier, who professes that he never trusted him, but thought him 'inclined to play fast and loose.' In them, Shaftesbury is described as a man 'of a healing and a reconciling spirit of all interests that agree in the greatening of himself.' While one of Cromwell's Council, he is accordingly said to be 'labouring to convince the people that it was desirable to choose

'(as members) such as were of healing spirits,' whereas, in a short time afterwards, having been refused the hand of the Protector's daughter Mary, he rushes into opposition, and is ejected from his seat in Council, 'Cromwell being resolved to act there as the chief juggler himself.' It was, however, in vain that the military party, to which Ludlow belonged, assailed him. Again, after Cromwell's death, he was summoned to the Council, and baffled their intrigues to expel him as one 'assured to Charles Stuart's interest.' Finally, he even got a seat in the relics of the Long Parliament, on his old election for Downton, and, to the disgust of the chiefs of the army, bore there a great sway, 'by his smooth tongue and insinuating carriage.'

There is yet a third source of information about this famous politician, viz. a few letters and notes of speeches, with some Parliamentary and Council Records preserved respecting him. Some are unimportant, though curious, as a letter, in which an intimate friend, Henry Cromwell, the Protector's favourite son, is addressed as 'My Lord and Father.' Others, viz. the records of proceedings in the Council of State, or the Commons, show much subtlety, and sometimes, even a force and eloquence which would astonish any one whose mind has been preoccupied by the assumption of Hume and other writers, that *all* the orators of the Commonwealth period, were tedious breakers up of lengthy dissertations into multitudinous heads. There are pithy apophthegms, unusual in our more fluent oratory, such as 'Unusual 'causes produce unusual effects;' 'words are the keys of the 'cabinet of things; let us first take out the people's jewels 'before you part with that cabinet:' together with some arguments against applying harsh measures to opponents of the Government, to Nevil, Sir Henry Wroth, and others. Among his *protégés* of this sort, we find his future colleague in the Cabal, Villiers of Buckingham, in reference to whom Mr. Christie well quotes from Burton's 'Diary' a noble remark by Lord Fairfax, the great general of the Commonwealth, who, to the loud cry that his simple word should be taken as the sole guarantee for his son-in-law Villier's fidelity, and not his bond of 10,000*l.*, answered, with a somewhat prophetic anticipation of the Duke's subsequent career, 'When I engage my estate, I 'know what I do; but when I engage his honour, I engage 'what is not in my power.' Nor are clever speeches wanting on matters of ordinary State policy, wars, and treaties, though with an occasional confusion apparent in them, not so much of ideas, as of facts; as, for instance, when in one, an oration against the giving of aid to the Swedes against Denmark, he argues, probably deceived, in common with the whole of Europe, as to the real force of Sweden by its late exploits in the Thirty-years'

War, that it's king 'may overrun Spain, Denmark, Pomerania, Italy, and make himself master of this part of the world,' where the juxtaposition of the North and Italy recals the Frithiof, of Bishop Tegner's Saga, equally at home in Norway and the Isles of Greece. But there were two prominent topics of Cooper's eloquence, viz. 1, Cromwell's Dictatorship: 'Never was so 'absolute a government. If the Florentine (Machiavelli) and 'he that sat in the great chair of the world (perhaps Pope 'Alexander VI.) had met together, they could not have made 'anything so absolute;' and 2, the recognition of Cromwell's new House of Lords. This was as furiously resisted by him seemingly in the interests of the old aristocracy, as might have been the establishment of Napoleon's military oligarchy by a partisan of the old French noblesse; and with this additional force in the former case, that, whereas the French noblesse had been long in a position of antagonism to the country at large, the English had taken an active part, in many cases, in the contest against the king, and maintained all their *prestige* and wealth. On these two subjects there is a constant ebullition of sarcasms; but there is one speech made in support of a motion, that the other House should last only for the Parliament held after Oliver's death, and then sitting, in which all his indignation and opposition wrath boils over. We should like, but for its length, to quote it at length. Some passages may be given to show his aristocratic tone of thought, and the boldness of the language which, we believe, Mr. Christie is right in affirming, he always employs when speaking of the Protectorate; for it must be remembered that, though, in one sense, these sneers were kicks at a dead lion, the House of Cromwell still kept the throne:

'I dare freely declare it to be my opinion that we are this day making good all the reproaches of our enemies—owning ourselves oppressors, murderers, regicides, subverters of that which we do not only acknowledge to have been a lawful government, but, by recalling it "(*i.e.* by creating a sovereign prince with a House of Peers)," confess it now to be the best: which, sir, if it be true, and that we now begin to see aright, I heartily wish our eyes had been sooner open: and for three nations' sakes, that we had purchased our conviction at a cheaper rate. We might in '42 have been what we contend to be in '59; and our consciences would have had much less to answer for to God,—and our reputations to the world . . . . It (Cromwell's House of Lords) is a house that inverts the order of slavery, and subjects us to our servants . . . . In a word, sir, it is a house of so incongruous and odious a composition and mixture, that certainly the grand architect (Oliver) would never have framed it, had it not been his design, as well to show the world the contempt he had of us, as to demonstrate the power he had over us. . . . . The foundation of this noble structure was laid in perjury, and was begun with the violation and contempt, as well of the laws of God, as of the nation. He who called monarchy anti-Christian in another, and made it so himself; he who voted a House of Lords dangerous and unnecessary, and too truly made it so in his partisans; he who with fraud and force deprived you of your liberty when

living, and entailed slavery on you at his death; it is he, sir, who has left you these worthy overseers of that his last will and testament, who, however they have behaved themselves in other trusts, will, we may be confident, faithfully endeavour to discharge themselves in this. . . . . And all this according to the "Humble Petition and Advice" which he was pleased to give order the Parliament should present to him—for, as the Romans had kings, his Highness had Parliaments amongst his instruments of slavery; and I hope it will be no offence for me to pray that his son may not have so too. Then with regard to the new lords themselves:—'His Highness, of deplorable memory to this nation; to countenance as well the want of quality as of honesty in the rest, has nominated some against whom there lies no other reproach but only that nomination. . . . But, Mr. Speaker, can we without indignation think of the rest? He who is first in this roll, a condemned coward (Nathaniel Fiennes) one that out of fear and baseness did once what he could to betray our liberties, and now does the same for gain. The second, a person of as little sense as honesty, preferred for no other reason but his no-worth, his no-conscience—except cheating his father of all he had was thought a virtue by him, who, by sad experience we find, hath done the same for his mother—his country. The third, a Cavalier, a Presbyterian, an Independent, for a Republic, for a Protector, for anything, for nothing, but only that one thing, money—(probably Lord Broghill, the friend of Cowley and Evelyn, though the reproach of changeableness is equally applicable to Cooper himself). It were endless to run through them all; to tell you of the lordships of seventeen pounds a-year land of inheritance; of the farmer lordships, draymen lordships, (probably referring to Colonel Pride, the slayer of the bears; also noted for Pride's Purge, and therefore no favourite with a House of Commons); Cobbler lordships (Colonel Hewson), without one foot of land but what the blood of Englishmen has been the price of. These, sir, are to be our rulers—these the judges of our lives and fortunes; to them we are to stand bare, whilst these pageant lordships deign to give us a conference on their breeches. . . . . I say not this to revile any man with his meanness . . . . I remind you of their quality, because they themselves forget it: it is not the men I am angry with, but their lordships.' And then for their capacity—'Sir, for great men to govern is ordinary; for able men it is natural; knaves many times come to it by force and necessity; and fools sometimes by chance; but universal choice and election of fools and knaves for government, was never made by any who were not themselves like those they chose.' But perhaps they had done great service to the State in war:—'I might tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the same honour is not purchased by the blood of an enemy and of a citizen; for victories in civil wars, till our armies marched through the city, I have not read that the conquerors have been so void of shame as to triumph. Even Cæsar had no days of thanksgiving to his gods, and anniversary feasts, for having been a prosperous rebel.' And what, forsooth, were the illustrious exploits of these new lords!—'To speak nothing of one of my Lords Commissioners' valour at Bristol, and of another noble lord's brave adventure at the Bear-garden; I must tell you, sir, that most of them have had the courage to do things which, I may boldly say, few other Christians durst so have adventured their souls to have attempted. They have not only subdued their enemies, but their masters that raised and maintained them; they have not only conquered Scotland and Ireland, but rebellious England too, and there suppressed a malignant party of magistrates and laws; and that nothing should be wanting to make them indeed complete conquerors, without the help of philosophy, they have even conquered themselves. All shame they have subdued as perfectly as all justice; the oaths they have taken they have as easily digested as their old general could himself; public covenants and engagements they have trampled under foot. In conclusion, so entire a victory

have they gained over themselves, that their consciences are as much their servants, Mr. Speaker, as we are.'

Whatever may be thought of the consistency and *morale* of this speech, its rhetoric and sarcasm, unaided by the enthusiasm of the audience—for it seems to have been made against time, in a half-empty House, are admirable. But we can hardly agree to Mr. Christie's argument, that the bitterness of its tone proves that its author had, at 'the outset, given an independent 'support to Oliver, in the hope of obtaining through him a 'settlement of the nation under good government, and had 'seceded from him, unable to support his measures;' for that 'this language could not have been publicly used by one who 'had been a tool or flatterer of Cromwell, or under personal 'obligations to him, without shame and reproach; and there is 'no sign of Cooper's having been taunted by any of the 'Government speakers with inconsistency or ingratitude.' Let alone the strong probability, acknowledged by Mr. Christie, that the language of it may have been touched up when the speech was printed, it does seem, and Ludlow's 'Memoirs' confirm it, that the accusation of shiftiness and insincerity was one very commonly brought against the orator.

We have now referred briefly to all the contemporary sources of information respecting the character and conduct of this famous statesman, in the earlier portion of his career. But Mr. Christie finds it necessary not to trust solely to his readers' power of sifting a good opinion of his hero out of them, but to commence his volume with an elaborate confutation of the life in Lord Campbell's 'Lord Chancellors,' in which all the charges against him, true or false, are found incorporated with additional ones of the author's own discovery. Mr. Christie's hypothesis seems to be, that an *à priori* prejudice has made the present Chancellor interpret isolated acts of his predecessor as demonstrative proofs of a habit of vanity, litigiousness, and capriciousness, in his political sentiments—the latter quality being represented as always made fast—though, within given bounds, veering round and round, to a hard basis of calculating selfishness; while his very vigour and grasp of mind, as lending itself as an instrument for the gratification of low worldly propensities is made everywhere, to define and give fresh depth and blackness to each bad quality attributed to him.

The accusations and the answers appear to us to divide themselves under three heads:—1. Mistakes, irrelevant in themselves, but perhaps interesting as manifesting the noble biographer's carelessness, or, it may be, want of moral courage to resist the allurements of an opening for a picturesque touch.

2. Statements on which the popular conclusion as to Shaftesbury's character has been partly based, and the erroneousness of which may be shown; and, 3, others which Mr. Christie assails, but, in respect of which, we scarcely think that the demonstration of unfairness is very clearly made out. We will attempt to indicate the chief points in each of the three divisions.

To begin with the somewhat irrelevant confutations:—it is without any proof that the following allegations are made by Lord Campbell, viz. that Shaftesbury diligently listened to, and kept notes of, the proceedings of the Short Parliament of 1640, —the solitary premise being the fact that he was a member of that Parliament—that, *to his deep mortification*, he was prevented in the next Parliament from defending Strafford, and Ship-money; and that he went to Oxford to solicit from the King the formal grant of the Governorship of Weymouth (whereas the journey was to Bristol!); that he fled from Oxford to London (a second heinous misrepresentation of his route, which was from Dorsetshire to Hurst Castle!); that crowds of country people used, during his shrievalty, to flock to listen, with admiration, to his stream of eloquence at sessions, quarter and petty; that he headed a mob in Lincoln's Inn Fields against the Officers' Committee of Safety (his followers being really a band of men who styled themselves soldiers on the side of the Parliament—a distinction without a difference); that he was appointed commissioner for the command of the forces (whereas he was a *pro tempore* commissioner only); and, finally, that he *contrived* to get seated in the House as representative for Downton, (the getting seated being the only *fact*).

In the following assertions, more direct damage is done to Shaftesbury's character, and they therefore call more imperatively for some answer. Mr. Christie shows, in opposition to the insinuation that from boyhood the statesman manifested a most precocious keenness in defending his own interests, that it was not he, but of course his guardians, to whom the preservation of part of his estate from the rapacity of his father's creditors was owing; that there is no more authority for making out the future Chancellor so impudent as to have aspired to the Great Seal after a legal training consisting solely of attendance at theatres and fencing schools, than there was for the already remarked upon exaggeration as to his early diligence in storing up records of politicians' sentiments; that what Lord Campbell describes as 'a flaming account' of his achievements in Somersetshire, in a despatch to Parliament, in which he took 'greater 'credit to himself than Cromwell in his despatch announcing 'his victory at Dunbar,' is nowhere to be discovered but in the

biographer's fancy. Then, on the subject of his political career and consistency, we are told that there is no evidence for the statement that 'he watched with envious eyes Cromwell mounting to supreme power;' that he was kept out of Parliament on account of 'a suspicion of his unsteady and dangerous character;' that he, an aspirant to the Great Seal, was overwhelmed with *ennui* while sitting on a commission engaged in the dull work of reforming the law; or that he relieved his spirits by such 'loud 'mutterings against the reigning authorities that he was actually 'taken up as a delinquent,' the solitary fact, which serves as the basis of this account, being the entry in the Commons' Journals, for March 17, 1653,—'Resolved by the Parliament, 'that Sir Anthony Ashley Cooper, Baronet, be pardoned of all 'delinquency,' a note which refers to the formal purging of no new offence, but merely of the old long obsolete delinquency of his original Royalism; that Lord Campbell, in his account of the Parliament called after the dissolution, an event rightly attributed to the co-operation of Cooper with the Protector, of the miserable Barebones' assembly, launches into a sea of errors: for that his predecessor neither joined the party which was for inquiring into the validity of the Instrument of Government, nor that he refused to sign the declaration in favour of the latter; nor that he was excluded from the House for so refusing; nor, finally, that by his intrigues, subsequently to this imaginary ejection, with the Opposition in-doors, he so wore out Cromwell as to force him to dissolve before the legal five months appointed for the session had expired. (It must be remembered, however, that Mr. Christie allows that Shaftesbury did cease to be a member a short time before the dissolution; and it is hard to see how this fact can be explained but on the score of a quarrel between him and the Government.) Then it is argued that the statement that he swore fidelity to Richard Cromwell, and in no long time after aided in bringing back the Stuarts is true, but that the deduction that it was perjury to swear allegiance to one 'as Chief Magistrate,' and then, when that man was deposed by the soldiery, to help in restoring the Stuarts, is certainly illogical; that he did not suddenly turn into a Royalist from a Commonwealth's man, but accepted the Restoration simply as an alternative, in preference to a military oligarchy; the assertion that the preamble to his patent as Baron Ashley, recites that he chiefly brought about that event, being a mistake, and the allegation that he *secretly encouraged* Sir George Booth's rising in Dorsetshire for that purpose, resting only on a casual remark of Ludlow's, that he dismissed a messenger who came to invite his co-operation, without any remark.

In the above-mentioned particulars, Mr. Christie seems to

have clearly convicted Lord Campbell and his followers, or authorities, of absolute error, or, at all events, of exaggeration or blind conjecture. There are other points on which the apology does not seem so happy; not that it may not be true, but a confutation should rest on more solid grounds than an equality of plausibility with the narrative controverted. Thus, it is true that the allegation that he warmly supported Hyde's view that supply should precede the consideration of grievances against Hampden and his friends, is much too broad; yet the circumstance that, notwithstanding the Committee's report in favour of him as duly returned for Downton, he was kept out of the House by his adversaries not allowing a report to be made, does seem to suggest the explanation that the Liberal majority must have feared his Royalist fervour. Then, however certain it may be that he was confirmed as Governor Weymouth against the inclinations of Prince Maurice, if this was on the understanding that he should resign in a few months, the keeping of Lord Hertford's promise to him to the ear only would scarcely soothe so wary a man, and the explanation, on the ground of pique, of his desertion to the Parliament may not be quite groundless. Again, when Mr. Christie exclaims against the conjecture that his retirement from the army was due to 'some affront or mere caprice,' as gratuitous, for that the New Model of the army explains it sufficiently, he forgets that, unless there were some private motive for his retiring, Cooper, as not a member of either House, and therefore not incapacitated by the self-denying ordinance (though his disputed claim to sit for Downton might have been urged), might have got himself included in the New Model. If his reason for not doing so, were an aristocratic dislike to the now very working democratic discipline and officering of the troops, Lord Campbell would be right in the spirit, though not the letter of his hypothesis. So, however reprehensible is the carelessness about truth, which tempts to the description of the man who always struggled against the tendencies of the extreme party in, and finally caused the dissolution of Barebones' Parliament, as one who 'joined zealously in seeking the Lord' with the leaders in that assembly, still there are authorities (and perhaps the final attainment of the prize by a mere pretended lawyer may be allowed as one) for the supposition, that it was the Protector's breach of his engagement to give Cooper the Great Seal which at first drove him into Opposition and Royalism. There is the same want of demonstration for the confutation, the same conflict of scantily-supported conjecture against conjecture, as to the occasion of the final and lasting rupture between him and the Protector. It is true that Lord Campbell's assertion, that

the proud Sovereign appointed the aspiring baronet a member of the Council of State, to conciliate so active a leader of Opposition, is at once overthrown by the certain fact that Cooper had held a seat in the Council of State before, but never after his retirement from Parliament. But against the hypothesis that his second and final estrangement arose from the rejection of his addresses to the 'musical glib-tongued Lady Mary,' Cromwell's daughter, and against the explanation of this alleged repulse, as arising out of his known dissoluteness of morals, Mr. Christie's defence of his hero is scarcely convincing. He is obliged to confess that Ludlow alludes to his being a suitor of the lady's, and, as for his bad moral character, he contents himself in conclusion with the very moderate assertion that he does 'not 'believe that he was the unmitigated profligate which Lord 'Campbell has permitted himself to represent him.' Indeed, low as is the trustworthiness of North, and facile as is the credulity of Bishop Burnet, and explicable as a mere piece of random wit as may be Shaftesbury's well-known retort to King Charles's—'Shaftesbury, you are the most profligate man in my 'dominions!' 'Of a subject, sir, I believe I am:'—yet they evidence the common belief of the time; and this, though not conclusive, is too strong to be overridden by the fact of a taste for science and literature, shared by him with a Wilmot, a Buckhurst, and a Charles II., or of the great care he always manifested for the improvement of his estate.

In fine, we cannot allow that, in all the particulars brought forward for investigation, Mr. Christie has fully made out his conclusions in the terms in which he has expressed them. Nevertheless, it may be said, without paradox, that he has in a great degree proved his point even in them. He may not have shown that the matter must certainly be interpreted according to his view; but he has thrown a doubt over his opponent's less favourable account sufficient to neutralize it: a sentence of condemnation requires to be supported by stronger evidence than one of acquittal: *à fortiori*, when the sentence has been given on depositions taken against a man just dead in exile, and whose friends' heads were bleaching on Temple Bar. In many other and most important details, out of which the universal conclusion so damaging to the statesman's character has been collected, he seems to us to be completely successful; he has shown most conclusively, what indeed has been long apparent, that Lord Campbell's 'Lives,' though interesting and full of well arranged information, are also full of errors, small often in themselves, but which, in the aggregate, wear out the truth as certainly as did the Lilliputian arrows Gulliver. The biographer has but too often confounded the idea of history and biography

with the idea of a magazine article; whatever might have been, if it do but connect facts (he does not consider whether it explains them), he assumes has been; every hypothesis is stated as positively as though it were a proved theory; and the reader is ever at a loss to distinguish that which is nothing more than conjecture, from that which is well-ascertained fact.

But, even when we clear away conjecture and assumption, it is hard to come to any satisfactory conclusion respecting the character of the first Earl of Shaftesbury; our only certainty can be that the popular historical opinion of it is not the true one. We are always exaggerating the unlikenesses between ourselves and our ancestors. All our powers of imagination and fancy are employed in conjuring up scenes monstrous in our own eyes, for the very reason that we have invented them for ourselves; they have been unnaturally pieced together of fragments, of peculiarities, real and actual in themselves, but which could never have been anything else but elements and parts, never wholes. The picturesque and minutiæ-collecting school of history, flourishing at the present day, has sprung from, and fosters this propensity of human nature. The details selected are, of course, not the everyday occurrences of our lives, unless in the greatest writers, as Macaulay; and so the deception is doubled, being not simply that of having a figure cut out in black outline presented to us as the complete image, but of having, out of materials so scanty, every detail supplied, when, in fact, its sole elements are the leavings of a scrap-book. Above all, does a danger of this sort arise, when, in consequence of the intensity of feeling produced by the circumstances of the epoch, much of what is strange and eccentric is to be found in its history: when mists are streaming over Highland hills, even the most unpicturesque tourists may look like the heroes of ghosts of Ossian. Shaftesbury's life fell in a period of this kind. He, a man with no remarkable capacity for zeal, worked among men who were afflicted by a sort of political colour blindness, so that all acts and characters they surveyed through one distorting medium. Because Shaftesbury was not moved by the same ardour, posterity, as well as his own contemporaries, have scouted him as a traitor alike to both parties. He was not an Ormond, or a Goring, a Hampden, or a Fifth-Monarchy man; he was therefore spoken of by the Cavaliers, and now, even by the eulogists of the Sidneys, as a cold-blooded snake-like traitor; while, all this time, he may have been but a Conservative-Liberal or Liberal-Conservative of modern times. Nor are the reproaches, from all sides, heaped upon him altogether groundless. It is a dangerous game for a party-leader like him to consort with an Algernon Sidney and Major Wildman and yet not be a Republican, either of the

Cato or of the Harry Vane sort, to subscribe to Oates's charges, without having the apology with which fear might furnish the Puritans, to abet plots of a son against his father, and of dissolute spendthrift courtiers against a Sovereign their boon-companion, without the excuse of the democratic fury of a Slingsby Bethell, or the recklessness of a profligate, boasting, like Buckingham, of his want of principle. So forced and unnatural a coalition is sure to taint the politician with the worst features of the extremes with which he has connected himself, while he develops none of their better traits, frankness of enmity and directness of purpose.

Here, in fact, lies, we believe, the defect both of charges like Lord Campbell's and of apologies like Mr. Christie's, viz. that while the former presuppose the existence in Shaftesbury of exceptional vice and worldliness to explain the catastrophe, full of intrigues and bad acts, which marked the close of his life, the latter are built up on the hypothesis that, to clear his character of an accusation of premature unscrupulousness, is to prove the scrupulous honesty of his later career. We do not concur with either view. Shaftesbury appears to us to have had magnificent talents not ballasted sufficiently by high moral principle, but neither, again, guided and abused by a monstrous and cruel selfishness. We cannot but think he must have himself surveyed his own history with curiosity, and marvelled how, in the frenzy of political manœuvring, he had got himself into exile, a suppliant to a State, of which, though it had never harmed him, he had, in the same incomprehensible tangle of party moves, vowed the utter destruction. Yet his own conduct does contain a clue to show that he was a party leader, not a demagogue or a tyrant's tool at any time. He is seen to turn round always just before the explosion, and to refuse to stay to await the chance of a practicable breach in the enemy's wall, at the risk of being himself first engulphed in the mine which he had dug more as a demonstration than with the plan of battering down a fortress. Refugee as he was at his death, it is even now hard to say whether he ever deliberately concerted a rebellion or a revolution.

It is unfortunate for him, that these autobiographical sketches do not contain the only evidence which could quite clear his name. Abundant evidence may be found in them of subtlety and of power of working on men's minds, or on their perception of their private interest, and, in short, a master genius for creating a new party out of any two or more old ones. Some evidence, too, we find in them of courage in speaking, and loudly, against the dominant party, when as yet the approaching cloud of unpopularity was but a speck in the distance. But

there is no internal proof that he believed in any set of principles, religious or political, only that he disliked new men and new powers when uncontrolled by himself. It is true that this negative testimony should not be allowed by itself to tarnish or overcloud a man's character. As for his own records of himself, modesty might have caused the absence there of any accounts whence we might collect much as to his nobler qualities; and, as for other contemporary evidence, statesmen, in a period of extreme opinions, are sure, if they betray any moderation in their sentiments, to be much spoken against by all sides; how much more so when the favourites of the two great parties were Charles II. and Titus Oates? Even posterity, always the slave of tradition, must, if the depreciation have been so loud as to have drowned, once for all, all counter assertion, repeat the same tale, till, if ever, a new groove and channel has been wrought, by which to let come in to us the independent testimony of a different kind. But when these independent sources of evidence about Shaftesbury's character, free from Tory bias, have been explored, and the result of the search has given proof of no one spark of generous or noble feeling in the man, but simply of his exemption from more than ordinary selfishness, the verdict of ages can scarcely be reversed; his friends must be content if the penalty be not exacted.

Then come the man's actions. It is not disputed that he veered round from one party to another: the excuse is the usual one, that they had changed their ground, not he. And it does, we confess, appear to us that, to a certain extent, the defence is satisfactory. Few great men in that lamentable reign of Charles II. were attended by their early principles for more than one stage in their career. Some only, like Holles, and they not the chiefs of their party, remained throughout faithful to the political type and theory which they had in youth believed in. Most were like Hyde, the truest of constitutional Liberals at first, whose end was to be impeached for taking bribes and expiate by banishment the crime of having been the tool and fool of a king traitorous to his realm. We would not, then, blame Shaftesbury for frequent changes of party when such were the party-chiefs. A little personal experience of those wretched Palatine Princes, his native keenness being sharpened by his private wrongs, might prove to his conviction that the fruit of victories gathered under their auspices, would be baneful: Clarendon, we know, and Falkland, and Newcastle, thought the same. Cromwell, again, he might stand by and aid at first, when a brief assumption of dictatorial powers seemed necessary for the prevention of anarchy; and him he might, with perfect candour, honour, and sincerity,

desert when he found him revealing his schemes for usurping a prerogative unknown to the constitution even under the monarchy. So, there was no self-demonstrated fickleness in his helping to bring back Charles II., to save us from becoming the spoil either of a military oligarchy, or of a tyrannic fragment of a Parliament. Still more completely, on the same principles, might be justified his co-operation, at a later period, with the Sovereign's steadfast friends and companions in exile, like Clarendon. And then, when these old councillors were found to be faithful only to the traditions of their youth, and reluctant to attempt to understand the new spirit which had passed over, and impressed itself on the nation, while they were in banishment—when, for instance, the same Clarendon looked to Lord Burleigh and the days of Queen Elizabeth for his rules as to the limitations of a Prime Minister's powers—even a man of high integrity and moderate consistent patriotism might have left his side, and acted against him. Some *apology* even could be made for a minister, who, in the embarrassment of having to advise a monarch, who desired to use the national resources as his private patrimony, and of making head against an opposition which had at hand the proffered help of the enemies of all kingship, and, in them, every phase of discontent and corruption, had first dared to adopt temporary measures of an unconstitutional character to carry on the King's government, and then, when he found his master expect that policy, which the statesman meant to be provisional only, to be carried out by his ministers, and developed as a permanent system, had displayed, what might, in the case of another man, have been styled the moral courage to announce openly his defection from, and repentance for having been tempted into such measures, and to demonstrate all this by using his information, and influence, and energy to counteract what he had been allured even into setting on foot. Finally, he might (and yet perhaps have found pardon, not excuse, on the score of force of circumstances) have been hurried along by the gradually growing consciousness that the King would have either absolute power or none, into that extreme position, in which the boundary line between rebellion and legitimate opposition becomes indefinable: even Lord Russell did the same.

Thus, every defection may be singly explained so as to leave Shaftesbury with a character for sincerity. Yet, as with the solution of the logical fallacy of Sorites, all together they constitute a policy which cannot readily be apologized for. As unsatisfactory a defence is the fact which might be urged in his favour that, at least, many of his shiftings were opposed to his own personal interests. He might, it may be alleged, have been first minister to Cromwell and the supporter of his son's

throne; he devoted himself to the doubtful work of restoring an outcast prince, And, again, from the position of chief favourite and counsellor to Charles II., he passed into hopeless opposition, which carried him, at one time, into the Tower, and, eventually, into banishment. Unfortunately for the competence of the excuse, the same might be said of all unsteady statesmen. Inconsistency is the most perilous quality or course in the profession of politics; unreasoning obstinacy is far safer. Unless Shaftesbury's apologists can prove that there was before his eyes, at the moment of each new move, no possible motive of self-aggrandizement by obtaining the leadership of one great party in exchange for a subordinate, however more settled rank in another, their appeal to his losses is no proof that genuine patriotism was the reason for his changes.

We shall look with interest for the subsequent contributions to the great Earl's biography which Mr. Christie promises. He has already shown that many of the specific charges against his hero rest upon a false construction of facts, or plausible conjecture, in the absence of them; and that, at all events, in early life he was not the thorough villain that most writers have delighted to paint. The accusation still remains, not rebutted, that hatred and intolerancy to a superior, or an equal, were his political principles and motives; that he may have preferred a free constitution to a tyranny, and the alliance of a Russell or a Holles to that of an Oates, but that, if no other instruments were at hand for securing his pre-eminence, he was ready to allow himself to be reckoned as a friend of theories of government the most arbitrary or revolutionary, and of men the most despicable.

ART. III.—*Travels and Adventures of the Rev. Joseph Wolff, D.D. LL.D. Vicar of Ile Brewers, near Taunton; late Missionary to the Jews and Muhammedans in Persia, Bokhara, Cashmeer, &c.* Vol. I. Second Edition. London: Saunders and Otley. 1860.

THE great problem of the conversion of the Jews is one of those which has hitherto proved insoluble. In spite of the immense expenditure of money, and the incredible exertion of those engaged in the work, the Jew remains a Jew still, obstinately refusing to believe that Jesus of Nazareth is the promised Messiah. It is true, that in the Reports of the Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews, we read of many of the sons of Abraham having embraced Christianity; yet, if we are acquainted with the arcana of that Society, we shall learn that few, very few, of these converts can be trusted; and that the managers of the Society have had to deplore the loss of some of their most promising converts, who have ended their connexion with the Society as swindlers, pickpockets, or in some other equally disreputable way. No one expresses more strongly his opinion on this point than Dr. Wolff, and no one can question his experience: he tells us that he doubts the sincerity of the conversion of almost every Jew, unless there has been some special leading to Christianity, something very like a miracle. As an illustration of the tenacity of unbelief in the Jewish mind, when even outward influences were withdrawn, he tells us the curious story of the Da Costa family, showing how Jewish prejudice lay, as it were, hid in Jewish blood, where outwardly the family had for generations been Christian. Uriel Da Costa was a Canon of the Cathedral of Oporto; he was descended from one of those numerous families of Jews who had been compelled to become Christian by Cardinal Ximenes and the Inquisitor Torquemada. The recollection that his ancestors were Jews never faded from his mind, and so strongly possessed him, that, calling his mother and relations together, he said, 'Is it not extraordinary that our ancestors have 'been Jews, and that they were forced to embrace the Roman 'Catholic religion? Come, let us read the Old Testament, and see 'what the Jews believe.' Having done so, they with one consent agreed to fly to Amsterdam, and there renounce Christianity and embrace Judaism. The Judaism of modern times, however,

little satisfied him; he saw clearly that the Jews had made the Law of Moses of none effect through their tradition; and he boldly rebuked his brethren. Such a mouth must be stopped; argument was tried, and failed; something more potent must be attempted; forty stripes save one were more than once laid on him, but without effect. Wearied at last with his own doubts, and the persecutions of his brethren, he put an end to his life, after writing his own memoirs, which he concludes with these words—'Reader, be not angry with me, I sought the truth, but did not find it.'[1]

The only conversions on a large scale were those forced ones under the Spanish and Portuguese Kings; numbers, like the Da Costa family, succumbed to the persecution; others chose rather to die than receive baptism. In the latter case, the children of the slain were received as god-children into the most noble families in those countries, were called by the name of their adopted parents, and intermarried, equally with them, among the highest in the land. So universal had these intermarriages become in Portugal, that when King Joseph I. at the instigation of the Inquisitor, ordered that all Jews and their descendants should wear, by way of distinction, a yellow hat, the Marquis de Pombal presented himself at court with three yellow hats: on being questioned by the king, whom the three hats were for, answered, one for himself, one for the king, and the other for the inquisitor, all of whom had Jewish blood in their veins.[2] Dr. Frankl tells an equally curious story with that of Da Costa, in his book, 'The Jews in the East.' Dr. Frankl, a Jewish physician of Vienna, had gone out to visit his brethren in Judea, and to establish some charitable institution at Jerusalem. While at Constantinople, in 1856, and present at the house of the Chacham Bashi, or Head Rabbi of Turkey, a young man presented himself, and told a very singular history: he was a Spaniard by birth and education, and had been brought up by his reputed father as a stonemason; when twenty years of age, his reputed father told him the real history of his birth; his father and mother were concealed Jews, living next door to the former, to whom they had communicated the secret of their race and religion: in a fit of anger the Christian denounced the

[1] An equally singular reconversion took place in Da Costa's family in 1820, 150 years after the time of Uriel: Isaak da Costa, a celebrated lawyer and poet, a man of great wealth and learning, who had been educated a Jew, having read the life of his ancestor Uriel, determined to examine the grounds of Christianity; 'Is it not extraordinary,' said he one day to his mother and family, 'that our ances-'tors were brought up in the Christian religion? Come, and let us examine the 'merits of this religion:' they did so, and he and all his family embraced Christianity: he afterwards became a great preacher.

[2] Les Juifs en France, en Italie, et en Espagne, par M. Bédarride, p. 554.

Jew to the authorities, the officers of police came and took away the Jew and his wife, put them in prison, from whence they never emerged. Though this youth had lived for twenty years as a Christian, ignorant till then that he was a Jew, no sooner did he know the fact than the old spirit led him to seek his father's religion, and renounce that in which he had been educated: he came to Constantinople to profess Judaism.[1] With such a people as this, real conversion must be rare indeed.

There is, however, a class of conversions by no means uncommon, both among the German Jews, and among those at Jerusalem; and that is, when such profession of Christianity brings some worldly advantage. In the East, covetousness is the leading principle of life; for money any deed will be done; among the Jews it seems almost as if the sin of Judas Iscariot had become ingrained in the nation that crucified its Saviour: though now the action is reversed: he betrayed Christ for money; these are ready to confess Him for the same. Dr. Frankl describes the wretched condition that Jews at Jerusalem are reduced to, in consequence of the abundance of the alms poured in upon them from Europe. The immense sums collected from the wealthy Jews of the West, supposed by them to go to educate the children, support the aged, minister to the sick, are embezzled by the collectors, and doled out to the community in just sufficient quantities to keep them in ignorance, idleness, and filth. Can we wonder that among minds so degraded, there should be little difficulty in drawing many to a profession of Christianity, if certain inducements are offered?

In Germany another principle is at work, equally destructive of Judaism,—infidelity. It is singular, as if a sort of retribution on children for the sins of their fathers, that the pantheistic and infidel schools of Germany originated with Jews; the fathers, in the Middle Ages, persecuted the Jews, put hundreds of them to death on the slightest pretences: the children of those murdered are now paying back their wrongs by poisoning the minds of Christians with pantheism and infidelity. From the time of Spinoza, the rationalistic school of so-called philosophy is indebted to Jews for its principles and expressions. Lower still in the scale of Jewish faith are the Jews of Prague; there, not money, but caprice regulates profession of religion. 'If a boy,' writes Dr. Wolff, who himself was there when a youth, 'if a boy does not get from his father what he wants, he 'says to him, Father, if you do not grant my request, I will '*hitch*,' *i.e.* apostatise.

[1] 'Jews in the East,' by Dr. Frankl, vol. i. p. 173.

In speaking of converts to the Anglican Church at Jerusalem, Dr. Frankl says:—

'The success of the mission is partly owing to the Jews themselves. While the conversion of a Jew to Christianity causes a painful sensation, and excites surprise, in a German or Austrian community, the same event is regarded with considerable indifference by the Jews at Jerusalem. It may be that they have grown indifferent, owing to the frequency of the event, or that they are quite willing to make a present of the proselytes, who are usually not remarkable for their high moral principle, to the Society. The family of a convert, though grieved at first, are soon reconciled to the change, and the family ties are not dissolved: he visits them, eats with them, he is still called "Reb," and addressed by his Jewish name. The family knows that, in most cases, his inward convictions have remained unchanged, and I have heard them say, "He will soon come back, after he has helped himself." Then there is great joy!—*Jews in the East*, vol. ii. p. 55.

In another place he says:—

'It is notorious that many Jews go to Jerusalem for the express purpose of being baptized, because their baptism there is attended with greater advantage to themselves. It also frequently happens, that these religious travellers receive baptism in the different cities which they visit on the way, probably as a preparatory process for their being re-baptized at Jerusalem. The following witticism from the lips of a Jew may be given as an illustration of Jewish-Polish humour, and of the operations of the Missionary Society:—"Baptism was the only good business we had, and who has spoiled it? The Jews themselves, by underselling one another." '—*Ibid.* p. 54.

This is a melancholy picture, but we cannot think it overdrawn, when we remember the miserable exposure by Mr. Holman Hunt of the Hanna Hadoub business. Dr. Wolff confirms the fact of the general falseness of the Jewish conversions; when at Gibraltar he was introduced to Mr. Ben Aruz, a wealthy Jew, respected by all the officers of the garrison as an honest man and a gentleman. During a conversation, Ben Aruz said to Wolff—

'I am very much obliged for the New Testament; I say always to my friend Cohen that Mr. Wolff is a very sensible man, of great talent, who gains much money, and eats well and drinks well, and believes in his heart what he likes: all the Jews in Gibraltar are a parcel of fools, who argue with you about the prophets and the law. I was in the world, and know the world very well; I have done myself, just what you, Mr. Wolff, are doing. I went about with bishops arm in arm; I lived many times in convents, and was the *galant homme* of all the ladies; but in the midst of all these things, in my heart I was a Jew —and so you are, Mr. Wolff—and you are right.'

Afterwards, when quite alone, Ben Aruz said to Wolff—

'Mr. Wolff, I am a man of honour, a man of secresy, and I assure you with an oath, that I will not betray you—but tell me sincerely, do you believe in Jesus Christ?'—*Wolff*, vol. i. pp. 155, 156.

No wonder poor single-hearted Mr. Lewis Way, to whom the Jews Society owes so much, got repeatedly duped and

cheated by his Jewish converts. On his joining the Society, and giving it 20,000*l.* to free it from debt, he took sixteen Jews into his house, and baptized them all; but soon after their baptism they stole his silver spoons, and one of them, Josephson by name, was transported to Australia, having forged Mr. Way's signature. 'Noble Lewis Way,' says Dr. Wolff, 'had one 'Jew still under his care, a young man of extraordinary talents, 'named Nehemiah Solomon, whose beard he had shaved off; 'and, after he had got him instructed in Greek and Latin, he 'had him ordained Deacon by Dr. Burgess, Bishop of S. 'David's.' Solomon was sent out as a missionary, but returned to Mr. Way, pretending that he had doubts respecting the Trinity. Way sent him to Scott, the commentator; after this he was ordained priest, when suddenly he ran away, having drawn on the Society for 300*l.*, and was never heard of afterwards.

On the other hand, the faith of the Jew in his old religion is striking and powerful. An old Russian Jew, travelling to Jerusalem to await the coming of the Messiah, met Wolff at Alexandria; Wolff told him that he too was going to Jerusalem to convert the Jews to Christianity; Yehiel replied, 'Sir, none 'will be converted; for we have been scattered now for more 'than 1700 years among all nations, persecuted and despised; 'our holy city destroyed; and the 1700 years have been passed 'in constant and continual endeavour by the Gentiles to per-'suade us that Jesus was the Messiah; but, at the end of the '1700 years we disbelieve it still!' He added—'Centuries and 'centuries have passed since Christians have tried to convert 'us, by pouring out our blood, and by persecuting us; and 'centuries and centuries have passed, and yet we stand a people 'separated from the nations, and exclaim every day, "Hear, 'Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord!"' No doubt the fearful persecutions to which the Jews were subject in the Middle Ages have passed down in memory to the Jews of the present day, with every addition that tradition could give: 'Nothing is spared, commonly, in Jewish families, to inspire early 'in the mind of a child the horror of the Christian name. The 'name alone; the sight of those things which bear the name; 'the appearance of a church, an image, a cross—above all, the 'meeting with a priest; even those things which meet respect 'from a savage, viz. a funeral procession, or a newborn infant, 'provoke the Jew even to blasphemies and curses against the 'Goïm,' *i.e.* Christians.[1] The few bright examples of converted Jews, like the Abbé Ratisbonne, or Libermann, seem to have

[1] *Vie du R. P. Libermann*, p. 3. Libermann was a Jewish convert, founder of the Society of the Sacred Heart of Mary.

had a special leading of the Spirit of God, and to have been brought to belief without the external aid of societies or missionaries. The like special leading Wolff believes to have been manifested in his own case.

We have thought it right to enter into these preliminary remarks in order to explain the condition of the people to whom Dr. Wolff specially addressed himself—to whom he was sent as a missionary; there will be seen from this, also, one reason for the want of success that attended his labours. For in some respects he was singularly qualified for a missionary among the Jews: himself a Jew, of Oriental habits, speaking twelve or fourteen languages, of unbounded energy, and unquestioned sincerity, we should have said he was precisely the man for the work; yet what, actually, has been the fruit of his labours among his own countrymen?

It is time, however, to introduce Dr. Wolff more particularly to our readers: before doing so we must say something of the state of the Jewish nation. The whole people may be divided into three great classes, known as the Sephardim, Aschkenasim, and the Karaites. The two former are more generally known as Portuguese Jews and German Jews; they differ very materially from each other, both in religious customs and in the pronunciation of the Hebrew language: there is, in the pronunciation of the alphabet itself, as much difference between these two bodies as there is in the pronunciation of the Latin alphabet between an Englishman and a foreigner. In religious matters the Sephardim are much more strict than the Aschkenasim. These are, again, respectively subdivided into a multitude of smaller sects. The Karaites form a distinct class, though small in numbers; their peculiarity consists in their rejection of tradition, and a careful regard for the sacred Scriptures. Speaking generally we may say that the Jews of Asia, Africa, and Portugal, and Turkey in Europe, are Sephardim; and the rest of Europe are Aschkenasim; Jerusalem being considered common ground for all. Dr. Wolff is, of course, a German Jew, claiming descent from the sacerdotal tribe of Levi: his father was first Rabbi of Weilersbach, in Bavaria, when Wolff was born in 1795. Flying from thence on the invasion of the French, the family came to Kissengen, at which place we are told 'the 'Duchess of Weimar, and the whole court of Weimar, and 'other visitors of the Spa of Kissengen, would frequently take 'him from the arms of his nurse, carry him about, and show 'him to each other as a prodigy' of beauty. It was at a Christian school at Halle that Wolff began to learn with his brother Jacob Leeb. Two beings more unlike could not be found; while the former was eagerly drinking in all the know-

ledge he could, the latter, who was a great deal cleverer, was more closely following the traditions of his fathers, and was making money by petty traffic in old schoolbooks, pins and needles—his great ambition being to set up in the hereditary old clothes line of business; a proceeding Wolff had no inclination for. Far more did he love to sit and listen to his father the Rabbi and his friends tell of the ancient glory of Israel, and of the mighty future that is yet to come. He heard, too, of the great rabbis and doctors of the Jewish law; men whose names were handed down to the reverence and respect of posterity. He was told how Moses-ben-Maimon, when a youth, vexed at his own ignorance and stupidity, left his father's house, went to the synagogue, and prostrated himself before the ark where the Law of Moses was, and remained whole nights in prayer to God for ability to know and understand wisdom; how his prayer was heard, and he became the celebrated Maimonides, the greatest of the rabbis, the friend of the Arabian philosopher Averroës, physician to the Khalif, renowned as well by Mohammedans as Jews; and Wolff longed to become a great preacher and rabbi like him. Strangely enough he heard them speak, too, of the grandeur of the Roman Empire; the magnificence of the city of Rome; of the Pope and the cardinals; till Wolff hung in doubt whether he should remain a Jew and become a great rabbi, or whether he should go to Rome and become Pope; having no doubt but that he could do either. Vanity, an egregious opinion of himself, and a corresponding contempt for the majority of his fellow-men, has been Mr. Wolff's besetting sin, as himself confesses it, all his life. A sin, and a great one, it is, without doubt; yet it is wonderful how it gets a man on in the world, especially when he is conscious that he can only accomplish greatness by dint of unwearied exertion; it is a spur that keeps the steed ever on his mettle, and carries him bravely through many a hardship and difficulty, before which others, perhaps of greater ability but less ambition, would succumb. Such characters are little troubled with that inconvenient quality that keeps so many in the background—modesty. Dr. Wolff was one of these, and he has the candour to tell us so; perhaps this very failing may have led him to inquire after Christianity. However it was, the leading to Christianity was internal, unaccompanied by any external inducements. Curiously enough, his desire to know something of Jesus of Nazareth was excited from hearing the Talmudical account of the death of Titus, the destroyer of Jerusalem. In this story the great Onkelos is said to have raised up Titus, and asked him how he would treat the Jews; Titus said he would torture them: Jesus is then raised, and asked the same question; He replies, 'Treat them well.' This

history made a deep impression on Wolff, and he asked his father who this Jesus was? His father replied that He was a Jew of the greatest ability, who was put to death for pretending to be the Messiah. Wolff thought, perhaps, He was a prophet, and put to death when innocent. It was, however, from a barber, named Spiess, that he first got the real answer. 'I will 'tell you,' said old Spiess, with his stern look, 'who the real 'Messiah was: He was Jesus of Nazareth, the Son of God, 'whom your ancestors have crucified, as they did the prophets 'of old. Go home and read Isaiah liii., and you will be con-'vinced that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.' Wolff declares that the effect of these words was like a flash of lightning upon his mind; he was convinced, and struck dumb. He read the chapter, and asked his father of whom the prophet spoke. His father answered not, but gave him such a look that he dared not ask again. He afterwards heard weeping in the next room, and his father say to his mother, 'God have mercy upon us, 'our son will not long remain a Jew. He is continually walking 'about and thinking, which is not natural.' Next morning Wolff ran off to the Lutheran minister, and said to him, 'I will 'become a Christian and a preacher; will you teach me Latin 'and French?' He was then but seven years old, so the minister was obliged to refuse to teach him. At eleven he was sent to the Protestant Lycæum at Stuttgardt. Before going his father asked him what he wished to learn? He said, 'Greek; that I may become a physician and a preacher like Maimonides.' The old Jews who were present stroked their beards, and said, 'Woe, woe, woe! your son will not remain 'a Jew; he will be mixed up with the Gentiles, and go the 'way of all the Gentiles.'

This dread of learning seems to be a characteristic of modern Judaism; even that art in which the mediæval Jews excelled, viz. medicine, is little practised. Bred up in the notion that all true wisdom is contained in the Law, and that the Talmud alone contains the proper explanation of it, the Jews systematically eschew other knowledge, excepting that which aids business. Besides, they see continually that a further acquaintance with European literature has, in many cases, led to infidelity, and they naturally dread the effect upon their children of an extension of learning. When, therefore, they find any of their children showing a taste for reading, they check it, and bid them study the Talmud—a book utterly unadapted to a mind at all conversant with modern European literature. Oriental in its origin, the Talmud is thoroughly so in its character. Its strange stories and quaint parables are precisely that style of instruction which the Semitic nations of the East to this day give to their children; entirely

differing from all Western ideas and systems; nay, we may add, they seem, to a Western mind, nothing else but extravagant fiction. Were they merely read as entertaining and instructive parables, like Æsop's fables, or were a selection made of them, and the extravagancies left out, perhaps much might be read with profit; but when it is taught as a matter of faith that all learning is confined to the Talmud, and its statements are to be received as the only explanations of divine truth, a really thoughtful and devout mind must doubt, and an irreverent one scoff at, what it finds there. We do not wonder that among the German Jews there is such a large amount of infidelity, and that rationalistic books are much read among them. The reaction on the mind which has thrown off, as puerile and incredible, the legends of the Talmud, stops not till it disbelieves all miracles likewise, and seizes upon a rationalistic interpretation as the only true one. The general *bouleversement* caused by the French Revolution, very materially increased this scepticism, and set minds doubting which would otherwise have continued in traditionary belief: there is a closer connexion between politics and faith than theologians are wont to take into consideration. As long as men were members of a political party, and received their doctrines on the authority of their party chiefs, spoke, wrote, argued, voted, according to the principles of their party, they relied, not on their own judgment, but on authority: once let the party leaders forsake their principles, and the party is gone; a *school* may remain, but *party* is broken up; because, each one now judging for himself, abjures authority; he may follow a party leader, but only so long as he agrees with him. Almost unconsciously the mind follows out in religion what it has already worked out in politics: it no more receives its faith on authority; it must examine for itself; it may arrive at conclusions strictly orthodox, perfectly in accordance with ancient creeds, but it does so on its own judgment, not, as before, on the authority of others.

The political revolutions of the end of last century and the commencement of this, had already reached the Jewish community in the time of Wolff's boyhood; Moses Lazarus Cohen, a cousin of Wolff, with whom he went to live, was 'a Jew of 'the modern style, rather leaning towards infidelity. He read 'the writings of Emmanuel Kant, Schiller, and Göthe; and he 'rather liked the idea of Wolff's love of study, and introduced 'him to the Lycæum of the Roman Catholics.' Here he heard the lecturer speak of the missionary labours of S. Francis Xavier, S. Ignatius Loyola, and others; he went home and said to Cohen and his wife, 'My mind is made up; I will become a 'Christian, and a Jesuit; and I will preach the Gospel in foreign

'lands, like Francis Xavier!' Cohen laughed, but his wife was very angry, threw a poker at him, cursed him, and turned him out of the house.

Wolff now commenced a series of wanderings from place to place, from seminary to seminary, from university to university, that completely puzzles an Englishman, accustomed to the regular school and college education of his own country: the reader is at once thrown back to ideas of mediæval habits, when students migrated from Oxford to the Sorbonne, from the Sorbonne to Salamanca or Padua, *ad discendas fideliter ingenuas artes;* it reads to us so strange, that a boy of from twelve to twenty should be found roaming about from place to place, gaining a precarious livelihood by teaching Hebrew, learning Latin, French, and Italian, that, whatever allowances may be made for the peculiarities of German student life, we cannot, with our English notions, quite comprehend it. 'He arrived at 'Frankfort-on-the-Maine, where he found the Jews complete 'infidels, and the Protestants the same. So he remained there 'only a few months, teaching Hebrew to get money, that he 'might travel further; and then he came to Halle, where he 'fell in with some professors, who were Rationalists.' 'He left 'Halle in the year 1810 [he would then be only fifteen years of 'age], and came to Prague, in Bohemia. . . . Wolff left 'Prague for Vienna, and from Vienna he went to Presburg, 'and then back again to Vienna, when every farthing of his 'money was gone.' Here an officer of the Austrian army accidentally met him, and allowed him to stay with him six weeks. Next he sets out for Munich: on his way thither, he came to Mölk, a celebrated monastery of the Benedictine Friars. 'He 'had read in novels, and heard even from Jews, that monasteries 'are the seats of learning, where one can improve oneself in 'science and religion. He therefore went to the Prior, whose 'name was Father Christopher, and spoke to him in Latin.' Here he was allowed ten florins a week and his food, on condition that he taught Hebrew to the students. The latter, however, did not like Wolff, and frequently set on their cook, who, he tells parenthetically, 'was a very handsome woman,' to tease him. One day she asked him if he would eat pork? On his saying 'yes,' she began to sing a ribald song, the burden of which was, 'Moses is dead.' 'On hearing this song, Wolff 'became so angry, that he gave the woman a slap on the face, 'and fled from the monastery, and came to Munich.' At Munich the Jews were most kind to him; he went to the gymnasium to study Latin, Greek, history, and also dancing; all which is prescribed by Government. The latter accomplishment Wolff could never master, so they set him to learn draw-

ing,—with equally bad success. 'So he left Munich, after a 'residence of six months, and came to Anspach, where he fell in 'with Protestant professors, all of whom were infidels.' Here he read the 'Wolffenbüttelsche Fragmente, which completely 'disgusted him with Protestantism, and determined him to be 'baptized into no other Christian Church but the Roman 'Catholic.' 'At last Wolff came, in 1811, to Saxe Weimar, 'where he was kindly patronized by Johannes Falk, then 'Counsellor of Legation at Weimar, at that time a complete 'Pantheist.' 'One day, he was walking out with Falk, when a 'gentleman, with a commanding and wonderful countenance, 'came towards them. Wolff said to Falk, "I am sure this is 'Göthe;" Falk said, "How do you know that?" Wolff replied, '"I have read his 'Egmont,' and I judge from that. For only a 'man with such a countenance could have written 'Egmont.'"' Wolff liked Weimar, but not its religious tone, so he proceeded to Heidelberg. From Heidelberg, he went to the famous monastery called Santa Maria Einsiedlen, in the canton of Schwytz, in Switzerland, where he gained some money by teaching Hebrew and Chaldean; with this he travelled to Soleure, where he lodged with another student named Biederman, both attending the lectures on philosophy at the college. Wolff and Biederman were great friends, so great that Wolff was induced to confide to the latter the secret that he was a Jew: this communication took place after they had gone to bed. 'Biederman was so frightened that he screamed, and 'leaped out of bed; the noise of which roused the landlord 'and landlady, who came in their night-dresses into the room, 'and said, "What is the matter;—is the devil here among 'you?" Biederman exclaimed, "Worse than that; Wolff is a 'Jew!" They were greatly shocked, but Wolff calmed them in 'a most wonderful manner by what he said.' He was from that time watched; and one day, before dinner, when the family were turning their faces toward a Virgin and Child, Wolff turned his toward the window; 'Sir,' said the landlady, 'our Lord God is not near the window: Our Lord is here'—pointing to the image. Wolff indignantly replied, 'Our Lord is everywhere; this is only a piece of wood.' He was required to beg pardon of Father Günter, for this saying. 'This Wolff 'declined to do; so he left the place, and arrived at Prague, in 'Bohemia.'

'As Wolff was passing a church at Prague, he heard a Franciscan friar preaching very beautifully, and staid to listen. After the sermon was over, he went into the vestry, and told who he was; whereupon the Franciscan friar spoke very kindly, and introduced him to Bishop Hain, to the Prelate Caspar Royko, and to Professor Ulman, professor of the Hebrew language. When

Wolff had related the story of his residence at Soleure, the Bishop, and the rest of the gentlemen said, "Thou art not a common Jew; we shall write to Soleure, to Father Günter, and, if all is as thou sayest, we shall instantly baptize you." This they did, and Father Günter wrote a very faithful letter in answer, stating the facts as Wolff had stated them: and so Wolff obtained his wish, and was baptized at Prague, by the most Reverend Leopold Zalda, Abbot of the Benedictine monastery, called Emaus, on the 13th September, 1812, being then seventeen years of age. His godfathers were Joseph Veith, and Charles Morawetz, and he received the name of "Joseph." He then went to Leutmeritz; when he was confirmed by the Bishop of Leutmeritz; and he received at his confirmation the names of "Stanislaus Wenceslaus," which, however, he has never used.'—Vol. i. pp. 20, 21.

Wolff's wanderings did not end with his baptism; he was sent with some monks of Emaus to Klattau, to form a Lycæum. Here 'his popularity drew down upon him the jealousy of the monks;' so he set off for Vienna, intending to study Arabic, Chaldean, Persian, Syriac, as well as philosophy and theology. Here he was patronised by the famous Count Stolberg, who, with Bishop Sailer, the 'Fenelon of Germany,' were at the head of a school in the Roman Catholic Church. They adhered strictly to the *dogmas* of the Church, but rejected the *opiniones piæ;* 'their minds revolted at the notion of *worship* being 'addressed to any but the Most High, through Jesus Christ. 'They believed in the infallibility of the Church, but denied 'that of the Pope.' Stolberg exercised a very great influence in forming Wolff's theological opinions, and it was the holding of these religious opinions, aided by his own inordinate vanity, that led to his dismissal from the Collegio Romano, and his final separation from the Roman Church. At the house of Stolberg, Wolff remained many months, and only left it when the approach of the French army broke up the household. Then he went to Tübingen, where he studied at the university for about a year. After this, he set out for Rome, travelling in primitive manner, on foot, with a knapsack. At Pisa, his means were exhausted, a stranger, however, advanced money for him to take him to Rome. On entering the Papal States, he saw a cross planted, with the Papal arms in the centre, under the word 'Pax;' a little further on, as a sort of set-off to this, was a gallows, with criminals hanging on it.

On the 5th September, 1816, Wolff entered the Collegio Romano. It is at this college that all the distinguished ecclesiastics are educated. 'Among others, there was Count 'Ferretti, the present Pope Pius IX., a mild, pious, liberal-'minded young man, who was well acquainted with the writings 'of Savonarola, and warmly recommended them to Wolff.'[1] Of

[1] This fact contains the key to understanding the proceedings of Pius IX. The liberal reforms which he attempted in 1848, were devised on the plan that Savo-

the discipline, instruction, management, Wolff bears the highest testimony. No part of his life appears to have left such pleasing recollections as that passed in the Collegio.

'Wolff is anxious here to have his opinion of the Roman College thoroughly understood. Differing, as he constantly did, from both teachers and pupils, in theological views. . . . he must yet uphold to admiration, the moral and religious training he witnessed in those establishments. Neither in the Collegio Romano, nor in the Propaganda, did he ever hear an indecent observation, either from priests, prefects, or pupils; nor see one single act of immorality. A strict surveillance was the system of the Collegio Romano. The Prefect called the pupils every day for the rosary prayer, and closed the doors of their rooms in the evening. On his opening the door, and awakening them in the morning, one of them had to recite the litany of the Virgin Mary, and the rest to cry, *Ora pro nobis.* After this they went to the private chapel, and read a meditation taken from the book of the Jesuit Segneri, which contains many good and beautiful things. But the description of Hell and Paradise there given, is the same Wolff once heard in a Rabbinical book, and in a Surah of the Koran. During recreation, after the first studies of the day were over, the pupils, invariably accompanied by the Prefect, walked out, and visited several churches, performing a silent prayer, for a few minutes, in each of them. After which they went to the Porta Pia, in the Quirinal, where there is always a gathering both of the inhabitants of Rome and visitors. There they might meet, any day, cardinals, prelates, princes, noblemen; their own friends, and strangers from foreign lands—Germans, Spaniards, English, French,—even travellers from Chaldea, Abyssinia, Jerusalem, &c.; and thence they returned to the college, when after a prayer each pupil retired to his own room for further study. In the evening again, they assembled in the corridor of the building, when their friends in the town visited them, and they conversed freely on any matter they pleased. Then followed supper, and then, before they retired to rest, they went again to the chapel, where a portion of the Gospel, and meditations from Segneri, or Rodriguez, were read aloud. Such was the daily routine at the Collegio Romano, varied, as has been seen, during vacations, by expeditions into the country, and even temporary absences; and in the Propaganda, to which Wolff went afterwards, the regulations were very similar, only with this addition, that, in the time of recreation, letters from all parts of the world were read, giving accounts, both of the progress of missionaries, and of their complaints that there should be so few labourers in the vineyard.'—Vol. i. pp. 83, 84.

All this excellent discipline, however, had not the effect of curing Wolff's vanity, and high opinion of himself. We find him contradicting professors in lecture, and enunciating his opinion whenever anything was said that he disapproved of. Imagine such a scene as the following in an Oxford lecture-

narola had attempted at Florence, and, like his, they failed; and failed from the same cause. Both ignored the elements of selfishness, ambition, covetousness, and malice, that are found so universally in man. Disinterested themselves, anxious only for the good of others, they thought that if they could ventilate their schemes of benefiting mankind, their countrymen would joyfully accept their plans, and join with them, heart and soul, to carry them out. How woefully disappointed Pope Pius IX. was, every one, who remembers the flight to Gaeta in 1848 and the accompanying events, well knows. For an account of Savonarola, see *Christian Remembrancer*, vol. xxxvi. p. 469, *et seq.*

room; Piatti, Professor of Dogmatics, was lecturing on Predestination—

'Wolff sat near him, at his right hand, when Piatti dictated the following words:—"My dear hearers,—This is a most perplexing subject; I therefore must give you a precautionary warning. The question of predestination is a very difficult one; therefore you must neither take the Scripture, nor the Fathers as your guide, but the infallible decision of the Roman Pontiffs. For Pius V. has declared, in one of his Bulls, that if any one should say that the opinion of S. Augustine on predestination has the same authority as the decision of the Popes, he shall be *Anathema!*" Wolff at once took fire, and said before them all; "Do you believe the infallibility of the Pope?" The professor said, "Yes." Wolff said, "I do not."'—Vol. i. p. 75.

Again—

'At another time the question was proposed whether Jansenius was a heretic? The rector said, "One cannot exactly say that, for he says, at the end of his work, that he submits everything he wrote to the decree of the Church. But if the Church had burnt him, she would have done well." Whereupon Wolff exclaimed, "The Church has no *right* to burn." The rector said, "How do you prove that?" Wolff said, "It is clear—it is not allowed to murder—'Thou shalt not kill.'" The rector said, "May a shepherd kill a wolf when he enters the flock?" Wolff replied, "A man is not a beast." The rector replied, "Seventeen Popes have done it!" Joseph Wolff replied, "Seventeen Popes have done wrong."'—Vol. i. p. 95.

One day they went to a Franciscan monastery on the festival of S. Francis; a friar preached; in the course of his sermon he said, 'Francis of Assissi has taken upon himself the sins of the whole world.' Wolff, on coming out of the church, said to his fellow collegian, 'That Franciscan friar is a jackass.' To which they all agreed.

It certainly bears out Wolff's assertion of the excellent patience, kindness, and forbearance of the Collegio, that Wolff was tolerated so long, and allowed to use his tongue with the freedom he did. By his own account he was petted and noticed by all the great men at Rome, being an especial favourite with Cardinal Litta; even the Pope took a deep interest in him; on his first interview with the latter, Pius said to him, 'You are 'my son. . . . . I shall give directions for your reception' (into the Collegio Romano); 'Wolff was told that his admission 'there was an unprecedented act of favour; and that the Pope 'had sent for the rector and specially recommended him.' 'Wolff gently and caressingly patted his Holiness on the 'shoulder,' saying, "I love your Holiness! Give me your 'blessing."' This 'patting of his Holiness' was the proximate cause of his dismissal from the Collegio Romano, and from Rome itself.

'One day, indeed, matters became quite boisterous at table in the Collegio

Romano. One of the pupils said, "Wolff, how could you pat the Pope's shoulders? Are you not aware that the Pope is God?" Wolff became as red as a Turkey-cock, and said, "How can you dare to say such a thing? the Pope is dust of the earth, *polvere della terra.* If he was God, I could not have touched him." All the collegians, and the professors, and rectors, and vice-rectors, rose from their seats, and exclaimed, "Wolff, what are you saying!" Wolff said, "This fellow called the Pope God; and I say he is dust of the earth; who is right?" One answered, "Is it not said, Ye are Gods?" Wolff said, "Yes, which shall be broken to pieces!" Another said, "He is God on earth, for he has all power in heaven, and on earth, and in purgatory;" and again, another said, "One may call him God, in a large sense." Wolff replied, "I shall not call the Pope God, either in a large or a small sense: he is dust of the earth." Another said, "He may be called God in a most pious sense;" and to Wolff's utter surprise, every one of the most learned men belonging to the Court of Rome defended and supported the expression.

'But here one frank confession must be made. It may well be asked, why did Wolff always attack the abuses and irrelevant points of the Church of Rome, when he was only a pupil in the place for a particular object? Protestants, as well as Roman Catholics, advised him not to do so. Niebuhr, Stolberg, and Cardinal Litta, as well as many others, all agreed on this point. They said, "You, Wolff, are only a pupil; you are neither Bishop nor Priest: be quiet till you have heard more, and have a position."

'Wolff answers frankly, that though he hopes that love for Divine truth has been one of his ruling motives from his youth upwards; yet his great enemies all through life have been—vanity and ambition; cherished and encouraged alike by injudicious friends and covert foes. He owns that during his life at Rome, his vanity made him believe that he knew everything better than those by whom he was surrounded: and as people told him he was like Luther in outward appearance, he resolved, if possible, to be a Luther also in his stormy and wild career: while, at the same time, his insatiable ambition made him wish and aim at becoming Pope, as he once openly avowed in the College; and being then an admirer of Gregory VII., he said he wished to be like him in daring and firmness, but to do exactly the contrary to what he did, and to signalize himself by abolishing celibacy, and the worship of the saints. He even told his fellow pupils of the name he intended to assume when Pope, namely Hildebrandus I.!'—Vol. i. pp. 91, 92.

After this explosion it was considered impossible for Wolff to remain any longer at the Collegio; not only was it seen that he would not submit his own opinions to those in authority, but that the moral effect upon the pupils rendered it imperative to remove him: he was sent for by Cardinal Litta, who told him in the kindest manner the determination of the authorities; 'And though I feel as if my right arm was being cut off, it is 'better that I should lose my right arm than my whole body; 'so you must leave us, for if you remain longer, you will spoil 'all the rest.' He was taken before the Inquisition, and examined there; he found, of course, that all his rash expressions, his correspondence, were known, and had been reported to the authorities; but, throughout, everything was 'correctly re-'ported, and no injustice was done to him.' 'With the opinions 'he entertained, many of which were totally in opposition to 'those taught at Rome, he certainly never was a Roman

'Catholic, in the sense which could have justified the Propa-'ganda in sending him out as a missionary.' The Pope's courier, and a guard of twenty-five gens-d'arme, and a member of the Inquisition, escorted Wolff out of Rome. He was furnished with letters to Lante, Cardinal Legate at Bologna, and the Papal Nuncio at Vienna. We may forgive Wolff for feeling his mind 'overclouded with gloom,' under these circumstances, but we can hardly forgive his attempt to pick the pocket of his conductor of the instructions respecting himself, or of opening the letters entrusted to him. To his shame, he found himself spoken of with the same unvarying kindness he had ever experienced, and the account of his dismissal just and true.

We have given a rapid sketch of the early life of Dr. Wolff, in something like consecutive order, we have traced his wanderings from place to place, till our readers, like ourselves, are probably lost in a sort of hazy wonder, how a boy of his age could manage to live on during those seven or eight years of constant move and change; mere existence under such circumstances becomes a problem. We are not accustomed to see a youth of fifteen and sixteen acting the part of a professor, and lecturing a class of young men, some probably older than himself, in the Oriental languages. Such distinction, while it fed his vanity, stimulated his ambition, and led him to an incredible amount of exertion. The boy is often the father of the man; the taste for wandering, begun in boyhood, has remained with the man to his sixty-fifth year; and prompts him now, at an age when most men wish for rest and ease, to go forth to new missionary enterprises, into countries hitherto unexplored by a priest of the English Church. That Wolff never was a Roman Catholic, in the Ultramontane sense, is probably owing to the same cause, as well as the influence of Count Stolberg. He had picked up his education at various places, under every kind of instructor, Jew, Protestant, Roman Catholic, Pantheist, Rationalist; necessarily he was obliged to judge and choose for himself; there was no regular training of his mind, no mental discipline; unless, then, there was a special quality of disposition to lead him to defer to authority for the resolution of doubt, and to seek from it repose of soul in the conflict of opinions, the natural result would be an independence of thought and speech, an eclecticism, quite fatal to submission to an arbitrary authority like the Roman Church. We do not say that such a mind resists authority, or denies it; we only say that it will not admit its power to enunciate arbitrary decrees, or articles of faith, unsupported by evidence. As an instance of what we mean, let us take the following story from Wolff's

life: being asked, when a pupil at the Collegio Romano, what study he liked best, he replied, 'The study of the Bible in the original tongues.' Cardinal della Somaglia told him he must not rely too much upon that; he must remember that the Church is the interpreter of Scripture:—

'"I will give you an instance: there is a word in one of the Prophets (he knew not which) which is translated, 'A virgin shall conceive and bear a son.' There was a long dispute about it, whether it means 'Virgin,' or not: and people could not agree, until the Pope was asked; and the Pope decided that it meant 'Virgin,' and then the dispute was at an end. So, you see, the Hebrew language is an ornament for a priest, but no necessity: for the Pope at last must decide everything." Wolff replied with a most unpardonable sneer, "How can the Pope decide, if he does not know Hebrew?"'—Vol. i. pp. 79, 80.

In this case the authoritative decision was perfectly right, but, because it was not based on a knowledge of the subject, it added to his mind no weight at all. To one brought up in the habit of constant deference to authority, no answer could be more convincing. The former will, however, implicitly acknowledge and obey authority (*e.g.* that of the English Church), when it is convinced that its doctrines and claims are all capable of proof.

It will probably be a matter of wonder with many, how the Propaganda could so long tolerate such a wayward spirit as that of Wolff; how it could ever hope to make out of such materials a champion of the Church of Rome. The prospect, certainly, was not promising; but Rome knows her work; out of very unlikely lumps she has shaped many a vessel to her honour. She knows how to infuse an *esprit de corps* into her servants; she knows what place, what people they are fit for; and she sends them there. Her real power, her immense moral influence, and her external authority, while they bind the mind, also relieve it from a load of personal responsibility, and smooth down heaps of difficulties. Removed from an atmosphere of doubt, relieved from the presence of those who would question and dispute her sole title to authority, the mind forgets its own previous questionings, and is too glad to rest on that authority, which it before was ready to dispute, and to use that as an argument, against which it used to argue; the bitterness and, probably, the ignorance of the opponent, only strengthening the feeling of reliance. Who can tell, if Wolff had been early sent out by the Propaganda as a missionary to China or Tartary, but he might not have been, at this day, a zealous upholder of Pius IX.?

It is clear, however, that he could no longer remain a pupil at the Propaganda; a young man favoured by cardinals, a *protégé* of the Pope, could not be allowed to go on questioning and disputing as he did; not only would discipline be at an end, but all moral influence over the pupils diminished, and their

faith endangered. We can only wonder that his dismissal was so long delayed, and, when determined upon, was accomplished with so much kindness and leniency: the whole account, as related by Wolff, speaks well for the authorities of the Propaganda.

Among the friends that Wolff had made during his stay at Rome, was Mr. H. Drummond, late M.P. for Surrey, and head of the sect of the Irvingites: the wealthy banker was present when Wolff denied the right of the Popes to burn heretics; and seeing clearly that such sentiments could not be tolerated at the Propaganda, invited him to come at once with him to England, an invitation which Wolff at the time declined. It was not, however, long before he availed himself of it, though the manner it was brought about was accidental. Wolff was at Lausanne —of course he had been wandering again after his return to Vienna—when he met a lady in the street: Wolff stopped her, and asked her if she was an English lady. She said 'Yes.' 'Then,' said Wolff, 'do you know Henry Drummond?'

'She replied "Yes," and like a flash of lightning she asked Wolff, "Are you Abbé Wolff?" Wolff said "Yes," and she said, "Come with me then," and forthwith brought him to the house of Professor Levade. She said, "I have been looking out for you for some time. I was at Rome, and heard all that happened to you there; and here is a letter that I have for you. You must go to England; Henry Drummond is waiting for you, and we will send you at our expense to London." '—Vol. i. p. 120.

To London Wolff came; Drummond took him round several of the dissenting meeting-houses to hear famous preachers; Wolff, however, had too much of the Catholic element to be satisfied with such worship as he found there; it was not till he attended the Church that he felt himself contented.

'Drummond said:—"I see you will belong to the Church of England; nevertheless, you will find a great deal of pride and annoyance in that Church, as well as in the Church of Rome." Henceforth, accordingly, Wolff considered himself to be a member of the Church of England; but his liberality towards other denominations was without bounds. So much so, that he took the sacrament from Dr. Steinkopf, of the Lutheran Church, one Sunday; and on the next, from a clergyman of the Church of England. His view then being (as it is to a great degree now), that members of the living Church of Christ, *i.e.* those who in the last days shall compose the Church, which is to be the bride of the Lamb, are to be found among the baptized members of all denominations; whilst, on the other hand, he maintains that the only divinely constituted Church is that which has preserved the Apostolic succession.'—Vol. i. p. 126.

The Jews Society, through the influence of Simeon, Dr. Marsh, and Hawtrey, sent Wolff to Cambridge, where he studied Oriental languages under Dr. Lee, and theology under Simeon.

'Wolff remained at Cambridge two years. He read almost all the works of S. Augustine, and Bishop Butler; also, the astronomical discourses of Chal-

mers; Bishop Kidder's writings, and the German divines; as well as the works of Bishops Bull and Andrewes, and Robert Hall's sermons. Everything he undertook he succeeded in learning, except one thing, which Simeon tried, but in vain, to teach him, namely, how to shave himself. Mr. Simeon actually appointed an hour (twelve o'clock), to instruct him, in the first place, how to sharpen a razor; but the moment Wolff tried, although Simeon had told him to keep the blade flat, he did just the contrary, and cut the razor-strop in two. Simeon gave him a slap, laughed, and gave up the shaving lesson.'—Vol. i. p. 136.

At the end of the two years, Wolff was asked to go to Stansted Park, Mr. Lewis Way's, 'to get a knowledge of the world, and to learn to shave himself.' When Mr. Drummond heard of this he wrote to Wolff—

'You are almost as great an ass as my friends Lewis Way and Charles Simeon are. What knowledge of the world can you learn at Stansted Park? Knowledge of the world can only be gained in the world.'

The truth is, that the Committee of the Jews Society had been so often disappointed in its Jewish *protégés*, who had generally turned out ill, that it was afraid to trust Wolff: the latter was anxious to commence missionary operations, so he left Mr. Way's clandestinely, to go to preach to the Jews at Portsmouth; he had not gone far, 'when Dr. M'Caul came after him 'at full gallop, and brought him back.' 'Simeon came to 'Stansted, and said, "My dear Wolff, you ought to stay a little 'longer for two reasons: first, in order to acquire more experi-'ence of the inner life of a Christian; secondly, in order to 'learn how to shave yourself. How can you be a missionary 'without knowing how to shave yourself?"' In this dilemma Wolff wrote to Drummond; Drummond wrote to Way one of his characteristic letters—'You are indeed a real Jews Society! 'eye for eye, and tooth for tooth, is your rule. I will not 'allow you to keep Wolff any longer; I will send him out my-'self!' This decided the matter; Wolff was called before the Committee, and asked, 'Whether he looked with respect and regard on the Society?' Receiving a satisfactory answer, the President, Sir T. Baring, gave him letters to friends at Malta and Gibraltar, determining that he should visit these places on his way to the East.

We do not intend to follow the remainder of Dr. Wolff's life with the same minuteness that we have the earlier; generally speaking, we are able to judge better of a man's character and conduct in after-life by his boyish antecedents, excepting, of course, such as have been subjects of some sudden change. The indications in Dr. Wolff's youth are pretty clear, and afford a true index of his future career. He considered himself specially called, both to Christianity and to be a Missionary to

his own people; his early life was spent in preparation for it. Borne along by this thought, and supported by an inordinate desire 'to do some great thing,' and leave a great name, he applied himself earnestly and successfully to the acquisition of languages, and of such learning as was requisite for the position he aimed at. His immense opinion of himself never allowed him to doubt what a figure he was destined to make in the world; and there were not wanting injudicious friends of the young Jewish convert, who unconsciously flattered this vanity by their attentions to him, and admiration of him. In his missionary tour he no doubt underwent great privations, encountered many dangers, even to that of death itself; all cheerfully faced, and patiently endured: the world applauded, he was welcomed at the houses of the great, nay, he formed an alliance with the daughter of an earl; but after all, what, in a Missionary point of view, has this effected? What converts have been made? Where has he extended the Church? We read of no new missions being opened, no churches planted, no body of converts made. Travelling with camel-loads of Bibles, preaching to different nations and tongues in their own language, with advantages which no other missionary of our Church ever had, we ask in vain for the fruits. It was the life of Francis Xavier that first inspired his mind with a desire to be a missionary—how unlike the results! Xavier planted churches, and gathered in thousands to its fold. Wolff's Mission, *as a Mission*, utterly failed. Let us be understood: we do not say that no good was done by him; that his travels and his preaching had no effect; on the contrary, we believe they had. The mere sight of a missionary of the English Church, going forth alone among Jews and Mohammedans, for the sole purpose of preaching the Gospel; the noble mission to Bokhara, to inquire after the fate of Conolly and Stoddart, could not fail to impress the Oriental mind, and might even yet be of immense value as a precurrent to a regularly appointed Mission; but of immediate results we see nothing. His name is still remembered in the East; stories of his actions and preaching are yet told over and recounted; children have learned from their fathers how a great English Dervish came among them, and told them of Christ and the Gospel; and the credit and power of the English nation was upheld and feared; but that is all. The best results we can hope for are from the effect of all this on the Oriental Churches; should the scheme of Hostels at Cambridge succeed, and the Eastern Christians be be brought *en rapport* with the extreme Western division of the Western Church, then we will say that his Mission has not been in vain. Dr. Wolff, however, in this matter must be con-

tent to divide his honours with others besides himself, particularly George Williams, and George Badger. In the western parts of Asia, we believe that the great obstacle to success among the Jews is the Jewish Society itself, with the wretched Jerusalem Bishopric; the eagerness to make proselytes—rendered necessary in order to swell out reports and satisfy subscribers—has a tendency to enlarge the number of hypocrites, and disgust real inquirers. The mixture of so much Judaism with Christianity does not catch the Jew, for it does not deceive him; it only makes him suspect the sincerity of those who bring down Christianity to a Jewish point of sight; he distrusts a form of Christianity, when it appears so different from that which he has been always accustomed to see.

Dr. Wolff, then a young man of twenty-six, was now sent out as a lay missionary to the Jews in Jerusalem and the neighbouring countries. He meets with Jews at Gibraltar, Malta, and Alexandria, and disputes with them, though with no success. Few, if any, believed in his conversion to Christianity; they thought he was only driving a good trade with his employers. Besides, the system of interpretation of prophecy which was then prevalent, of spiritualizing everything, and evacuating its literal meaning, or rather of making it mean anything the interpreter chose, could have no effect upon the Jew, since it clashed with his traditional method of interpretation. However, he went on to Jerusalem with twenty camels loaded with Bibles; there he disputes with the most learned Jews, and is taught by one of their Rabbis—apparently a freethinker—to confute them from the Talmud. Jerusalem was, however, too limited a sphere for his exertions; Mesopotamia, Persia, Bokhara, Armenia, as well as European Turkey and the Levant, were all visited. He finds Jews in all places, preaches to them, and distributes Bibles, but makes no converts. These Bibles, however, if they did not convert the Jews and Mohammedans, preserved Wolff's life, or, at least, saved him from being made a slave. Travelling in Persia, he was set upon by a band of Kerahe; they came rushing upon him demanding money; they ordered him to dismount—

'He obeyed; when they stripped him naked, like Adam and Eve when they were created, and tied him with a long rope to a horse's tail, and one with a whip came behind and flogged him. Wolff prayed!—in such hours one learns to pray.

'The chief of the gang, a horrid-looking fellow, of black complexion, with a blue diseased tongue, came up to him, and asked him, "Who art thou?" Wolff replied, breathing hard, and scarcely able to speak, "I am a follower of Jesus;" and the chief, horror-struck, replied, "A follower of Jesus?" "Yes," Wolff said, "a follower of Jesus; and I go about for His sake."

'Wolff found out during his travels among savages, that it is exactly with them, as it is with the devil himself: for they believe in Jesus, but it is a

belief that makes them tremble—it is a torment to them. . . . . They then set a value on the slaves they had taken, and Wolff's servant was valued at ten tomauns, equal to 5*l.*; but when they came up to Wolff and looked at him, they said, "We don't like this fellow at all; he stares at us so." Then one of them said, "He is worth five tomauns," equal to 2*l.* 10*s.*; whilst another said, "I would not give half that price for him." And whilst thus valuing and examining the prisoners and their effects, they found the letters of recommendation which Joseph Wolff had: as, for instance, letters from, and for Abbas Mirza; letters from Sir R. Gordon; from the Governor-General of India, &c. Then they asked Wolff the purport of these letters; and on his explaining this to them, they were horror-struck, and said, "Now this is a dangerous man: we see from his looks, and from these letters, that he is not a common man."'

Some advised that he should be killed, and his letters, &c. destroyed, and nothing more said about him.

'All this was said in Wolff's presence, and of course he did not like it. He therefore went up to them, and stared in their faces, and said, "I have understood all that you have said, and the resolution you have come to. Your reasoning is very good, but it has only one fault, and that is, that you are too late. I also knew how to calculate, and have laid my plans accordingly." They asked, "What plans have you made?" Wolff replied, "Ask each of my travelling companions separately, and they will tell you what I have done in Rooshna-Abaad;" and so they did as Wolff told them, and then they heard how he had written in all the Bibles, and had left them to be sent to Abbas Mirza. On discovering this they became pale as death,' &c.—Vol. i. pp. 491—493.

The precaution Wolff had taken was to write in several Arabic and Persian Bibles, a letter in Arabic and English to Abbas Mirza, to tell him that if the writer did not arrive with the Bibles, it was to be concluded that he had been made a slave. No wonder these men were frightened, since they were, professedly, part of Abbas Mirza's army. Still he was not quite safe; dead men tell no tales, and Wolff was dangerous as a living man: he therefore promised them a ransom; but how to raise the money? Again the Bibles came to his help; he had some in Hebrew, in these he wrote a letter to the Jews of the place whence the robbers came, telling the Jews to ransom him, giving them the Bibles for payment. On their arrival at the place, Wolff was thrown into prison; he was, however, soon liberated by the arrival of Muhammed Iszhak Khan, who had been sent by Abbas Mirza:—

'Muhammed Iszhak Khan was eating his dinner when Wolff approached him, and he said, "Abbas Mirza has written to me, that thou goest about to show the nations the way of truth. For my part I have no religion. I have already passed this world and the other world; I have got, however, one good quality, and that is, I am a man of justice: I love strict justice; and, therefore, tell me the truth, and you shall see my justice. How much money have these rascals taken from you?" Wolff said, "They have taken from me eighty tomauns." He repeated, "Eighty tomauns?" Wolff replied, "Yes." He then said, "Now thou shalt see my justice." So he instantly ordered Hassan Khan Coord, and all his followers, to be dreadfully flogged. He extorted from them every farthing; and, after he had got back Wolff's money, he counted it, and said, "Now thou shalt see my justice;" and

putting the money into his own pocket, without giving Wolff a single penny, he added, "Now, you may go in peace." '—Vol. i. pp. 501, 502.

We have given the above as a specimen of 'Wolff's Travels and Adventures;' we assure our readers that there are many other quite as curious and interesting. He introduces us to all kinds of Mohammedans and Jews, orthodox and heretical; some that prayed to saints, others who worshipped the devil; some who belonged to secret societies, as the Druses—among which latter must be included Lady Hester Stanhope—and some of no religion at all. At Salonica he meets with a very curious sect of the Jews: they are called by the Turks, 'Domna,' which means, 'the turned.'. They have their origin from an impostor who pretended to be the Messiah:—

'Shabatay Zebee, born at Sköp, in Bulgaria, was a Jew of great learning, and was said to have performed many miracles, when he suddenly rose, and proclaimed himself to be the Messiah. He travelled about in royal pomp, and thousands rallied round his standard in Aleppo, Smyrna, Jerusalem, Prague in Bohemia, and Vienna. He abolished the law of Moses; for they say the prophet Jeremiah says (Jeremiah xxxi. 31), "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah!" Now, is it not extraordinary, Wolff asks, that whilst these men reject the Lord Jesus Christ, because, as they say, He had abolished the law of Moses, they yet produce, as an evidence of Shabatay Zebee's Messiahship, the very fact of his abolition of the law of Moses?

'Shabatay Zebee ruled with uncontrolled power over thousands and thousands of the Jews; and they paid tribute to him. He sanctioned every vice, until at length he drew upon himself the attention of the Sultan, who had him brought to Constantinople, when, in order to save his life, this deceiver became a Muhammedan. But the man was too restless to be quiet, and so at last the Sultan had his head struck off. But even this has not diminished the number of his followers, and they apply to him the fulfilment of Isaiah's prophecy (Isaiah liii. 8), "He was cut off out of the land of the living." There are now about 200,000 of his dupes still existing; and, wherever they are, they conform outwardly to the ruling religion of the country: but they intermarry with none, and in secret they carry on their own religion.'—Vol. i. pp. 436, 437.

Dr. Wolff does not hesitate to express his belief in modern miracles, both divine and diabolical: he believes in the miraculous wounds of the celebrated nun, Catherine Emmerich, who bore on her person the five wounds of Christ. At Cairo, he witnessed a piece of magic similar to that seen by Lord Prudhoe (now Duke of Northumberland) and Major Felix; by which a thief was discovered. The following story Wolff offers to affirm with an oath. A certain M. Lustaneau, who had been general of Tippoo Sahib against the English, was living as guest with Lady Hester Stanhope on Mount Lebanon; Lady Hester ordered her servants to address him always as *Le Prophète*, because he claimed prophetical powers. Wolff was at the house of Mr. Barker, British Consul at Aleppo; the latter had said

to Wolff, Lady Hester 'is undoubtedly crazy, and, as a proof of it, I will show you this letter.' Her letter was written in April 1821: Wolff was at Antioch, with Mr. Barker, in May 1822; the letter was as follows—'My dear Mr. Barker, I 'beseech you not to go to Aleppo or Antioch, for both cities 'will be utterly destroyed in about a year. I tell you this in 'the name of the Prophet Lustaneau.' Wolff did go to Aleppo; and when at dinner at M. Lesseps', the French Consul, the interpreter, M. Derché, arrived from a visit to Lady Hester, bearing a message, that in less than a fortnight Aleppo would be destroyed, according to Le Prophète Lustaneau, *par une tremblement de terre;* which earthquake happened when Wolff was in the immediate neighbourhood of the place, by which Aleppo was destroyed.

As we have not yet seen the second volume, it being still in the publisher's hands, we are able to say nothing more than we have said of the actual missionary labours of Dr. Wolff, or their results; we reserve our judgment on this point till we have seen the whole work: the first volume certainly does not give us a high notion of their value, though we fully admit the benefit of his exertions in other respects.[1]

The work, though an autobiography, is written throughout in the third person, a plan which is certainly a very desirable one to be followed by many authors besides Dr. Wolff; it avoids the disagreeable and offensive repetition of the pronoun 'I;' it allows the writer to say things of himself which he could hardly say, in the first person, without manifest egotism; he can also

[1] It is only fair to give Dr. Wolff the benefit of his own explanations. The following is a portion of a letter addressed to the Editor of the *English Churchman*:—

'Now you have the boldness to declare that all my wandering—in the course of which I have circulated thousands of Bibles and preached the Gospel in places where it never was preached before, and have saved fellow-Christians from death (as I did in Cyprus), and sent the children of those parents who *were* slain in Cyprus to England for education, and saved Jews in *Khorrossaun* and Palestine and Persia from imprisonment, and ransomed Persian slaves in the desert of *Mowr*—had done no good to the Church!

'Many of my friends tried to console me, by declaring that the writer of the *English Churchman* was a *woman*. I don't believe that, for *women* have tender feelings. Women followed our Lord to the grave, and women have ever been ready to acknowledge the weak endeavours of Christ's servants to promote His ever-blessed Name!

'You call me the "wandering Jew." Be it so—yet certainly you are my brother according to the flesh. I am, by my father's side, of the *Tribe of Levi*, a lineal descendant of Moses; and on my mother's side, as I was told, of the *Tribe of Naphtali*—"*a hind let loose.*" But you are of the *Tribe of Issachar*—"*a strong ass,*" *not* "*wandering,*" for which you are too indolent, but "*a strong ass, couching down between two burdens*" (Gen. xlix. 14), *the High and Low Church*, not knowing which to carry, and thus starving or picking up a precarious subsistence between the two, and *knowing nothing else but to bray.*—I am, nevertheless, dear sir, your brother according to the flesh,

'JOSEPH WOLFF.'

indulge in a sort of commentary on himself, and his actions, by no means unpleasant, either to himself or his readers, and lets us, every now and then, into the secrets of his own mind, and of his personal opinion of himself. He can thus tell us that when he visited the nunnery at Novara, on his way to Rome, the abbess, who was a French Countess, 'gave Wolff her two 'cheeks to kiss, which he did with great grace.' Also, when at the Propaganda, 'on the day of Epiphany, the pupils gave 'an "academia" in forty-two languages. It was in the evening. 'All the ambassadors were present, and all the cardinals, and 'the German artists, and the French priests. Wolff spoke in 'five languages, and chanted so that the hall rang again: and 'all the auditors were in raptures, and applauded him; and the 'Italian collegians of the different colleges present, kept saying, '"Look at him! look at him! what tremendous eyes he makes!" '*Guardateli, guardateli, gli occhi che fa!* After the whole was 'over, the servants of the cardinals, together with their masters, 'slapped his back and said, *Per Bacco! per Bacco! che voce!* '*che voce! che occhi! che occhi!* An Armenian bishop said, '"His voice goes up above the heavens."'

Not the least curious part of this volume is the table of 'Errata;' besides the usual printer's blunders, in dates, quotations in foreign languages, proper names, &c., which are to be expected, we are told to make such corrections in the text as the following:—*for* naked *read* in their night-dresses. *Omit* a nasty jealous fellow. *For* jackass *read* man. *For* a nasty *read* an. *For* the rascal *read* he. Our copy is the second edition!

ART. IV.—*Sunday. Its Origin, History, and Present Obligation, considered in Eight Lectures Preached before the University of Oxford.* By JAMES AUGUSTUS HESSEY, D.C.L. London: John Murray. 1860.

WHETHER the subject of the Bampton Lecture for 1860 is the one which is best suited to the present necessities of Oxford thought, may be questioned by persons who happen to reside within the precincts of the University. Ten or twenty years ago, Dr. Hessey could not have chosen a more useful subject than 'Sunday.' Infidel speculation had yielded, at least in Oxford, to the moral force and genius of the great teachers of the movement of 1833. There were many questions, Sunday among the rest, to be set on a satisfactory footing within the walls of the City of God. There was no immediate necessity for setting up her bulwarks. But times have changed; and it would be difficult to name any one revealed truth which is not exposed to the direct or indirect assaults of the (so-termed) negative criticism. The most earnest thought is engaged in the examination of points which our fathers took for granted, and which are first principles in Christian theology. Not a few most promising young men have given in their adhesion to the refined idealism of Mr. Jowett, or to the materialistic sensualism of the late Professor Powell. 'We see not our tokens.' With the exception of the learned and intrepid Regius Professor of Hebrew, no divinity professor, so far as we are aware, has attempted a public reply to the destructive criticism. Under these grave circumstances, those who really believe in the existence and sacredness of the deposit of revealed truth committed to the Church, look with no little anxiety to the yearly product of the Bampton Lecture, which may be regarded as a providential provision for our present distress. This feeling was not wholly disappointed by Mr. Rawlinson—it was entirely responded to by the masterly and already classical work of Professor Mansel. It is recognized, rather by the appearance of Dr. Hessey in the pulpit of St. Mary's, than by the subject which he has chosen for his Bampton Lecture.

But Dr. Hessey is a scholar and a man of large and varied information. He has accordingly produced a work which cannot but ensure a large share of attention at the hands of the general public. His subject has the advantage of at once commanding an almost universal interest. To appreciate Professor Mansel, it was necessary to have some sort of relation, whether friendly or antagonistic, to the Hamiltonian school of thought. Sunday is a question, not of abstract speculation, but of popular

and practical life. 'How to observe it, and why?' is an inquiry upon which every dissenting minister, every father of a family, every master manufacturer, no less than every clergyman, must have an opinion. The observance of Sunday furnishes the Puritan school with their one opportunity for casuistic disquisition. 'The Sabbath' is the graven image which the pupils of Dr. Arnold smite most lustily with the axes and hammers of critical and latitudinarian scorn. No question yields more embarrassment to the serious Churchman. On the one hand, he is painfully alive to the theological fallacies which underlie the popular observance; on the other, he fears to remove that which he may be unable to replace. To feel a keen interest in the subject of Dr. Hessey's book, you need only be an Englishman in this nineteenth century. In France, the question has, we fear, long ago been settled in one way, though there are yearnings after better things. In Scotland, it is as yet no less certainly settled in another. With ourselves, taking the people at large, it is eminently unsettled, both as a question of theory and as a question of practice. Dr. Hessey, then, has brought together a mass of facts and considerations, some of them inaccessible to most of us, and all of them tolerably pertinent to the matter in hand. If his style is somewhat heavy, this may be inseparable from a careful treatment of his subject. If he is a little egotistical, this may be, after all, nothing more than the honest expression of a responsibility for such opinions as are his own. We shall presently have to notice an instance of, as we think, culpable deference to popular irreverence; but with this exception, his book appears to be entitled to the place which it will doubtless occupy in the libraries of Churchmen. It is a complete and very exhaustive treatise upon the subject in question.

The question of the Sabbath carries us back to the creation. The history of the Sabbath, according to Dr. Hessey, is coeval only with the Mosaic dispensation. The Sabbath observance was not a moral or natural precept, discoverable apart from a revelation from God. It was a positive precept, but it enshrined a moral element:—

> 'In so far as the commandment to observe the Sabbath implied positions discoverable by the light of reason (namely, 'that our Creator demands our gratitude and worship, and that these are best exhibited, and most surely paid, by periodic appropriation of our time to Him), there is a natural or moral element upon which the commandment is founded.'—*Lectures*, p. 131.

Certainly, every positive precept of God implies a moral obligation to observe it. Such obligation arises partly from the intrinsic reasonableness of the precept, although such

reasonableness might not be discoverable antecedently to the precept's being delivered. Still more is it based on the relation of the creature to the Creator who gives the precept. He speaks, and man obeys, because it is He who speaks. On the other hand, God is as free in enacting positive precepts as He is in creation. No sooner had infinite love poured itself forth in creating a moral world, than the moral law—the eternal harmonies of God's nature phrased in human language, and moulded to the requirements of human life and society—flowed forth also as the natural, necessary correlative of that world. We cannot conceive of God creating human society, and yet not forbidding murder, adultery, theft, and lying. We cannot conceive of Him as not exacting public acknowledgment and worship at the hands of His creatures. The truth of His nature is impaired, in our apprehension of it, if we imagine God having relations to human society, of which this moral law is not a constituent and essential feature. But God might have exacted that worship which He could not but exact, under what conditions He pleased. The particular periodicity of worship, however conducive to its vigour and life, is not of its essence. No instinct could, without express revelation, expand into the recognition of the seventh day as God's day, although the instinct of worship is in every human breast, a profound and divinely-implanted witness to the existence of the Creator.

There was, then, no necessity for a primitive revelation of Sabbath observance. It was no part of that moral law for which the heathens were in their degree responsible. The Canaanites were not reproached by the Jewish Lawgiver for their neglect of the Sabbath, although they are held guilty, and threatened with extermination for their various infractions of the moral law. But the question arises, Was the Sabbath given as a matter-of-fact, in the primitive antediluvian period, to man? For if this were the case, as our lecturer observes, it may be *almost* deemed a part of man's nature, and so binding upon mankind for ever.

This question Dr. Hessey answers in the negative. The Sabbath, he argues, cannot have been enjoined in Paradise, under circumstances which would have rendered the terms of the injunction unmeaning to our first parent. No allusion to it occurs in the very circumstantial lives of the patriarchs, in the book of Genesis. Its non-observance is not mentioned as a crime of the antediluvian world, which provoked God's vengeance. The division of time does not necessitate the hypothesis of a primitive Sabbath; it resulted from a natural phenomenon which would have forced itself upon man's earliest attention, viz. the changes of the moon. If, then, in the history of the

creation, God is said to have 'blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it,' this must refer (Dr. Hessey argues) to an appropriation of the day in the mind of the Almighty. It does not imply any primitive promulgation of the law of Sabbath observance. No such promulgation took place, in fact, before the Mosaic period.

Desiring to speak respectfully of Dr. Hessey's conclusion, we cannot but feel that arguments are too nearly balanced to allow of its being irresistible. The 'weeks' which occur in the history of the flood (Gen. vii. 10; viii. 10, 12), in the language of Laban (Gen. xxix. 27), and in the account of Joseph's mourning for his father, seem to imply a religious, rather than a natural or astronomical association. Dr. Hessey sees the institution of the Sabbath in the history of the manna-gathering, before the Sinaitic revelation. He urges that the perplexity of the rulers at the double quantity which fell on the sixth day, no less than the instructions of Moses which followed, alike prove that the 'Sabbath was till then entirely unknown to the Israelites.' To us the conclusion does not appear so simply necessary. Taking into account the inconstant character of the early Hebrews, and the probable results of their contact with the Egyptian civilization, in the capacity of its slaves, we see no difficulty in supposing that a patriarchal tradition may have existed, and yet have died out, almost entirely, and that it was practically revived at the giving of the manna, in order to prepare the people for the reception of the Sinaitic precept. And that construction of the word 'remember' in the Fourth Commandment, which represents it as intended for a post-Sinaitic generation, implies that it can have no force at the time of its utterance. The word seems to invite the supposition of a primitive Sabbath. Utterly, therefore, as we shrink from saying, with the impetuous positiveness of Canon Wordsworth,[1] 'that 'the Law of the Sabbath dates from the same time as that of 'marriage,' there do seem to be grounds for hesitating altogether to adopt the conclusion which the Bampton Lecturer holds in common with Archbishop Bramhall and Archdeacon Paley, and fortifies by authority so entitled to respect as is that of Venerable Bede.

Undoubtedly, the Sabbath, as enjoined from Sinai, if it succeeded to a patriarchal observance of any kind, must have differed from it in definiteness of purpose, as well as in its object. It was a sign between God and the people of His choice. It pointed to Him as their Deliverer from Egypt. It shadowed out to the weary wanderers of the desert their rest in Canaan.

[1] Occasional Sermons, p. 37, serm. xliv.

And for those who had faith, which could pierce the veil which hung between the heart and the ordinances of the Jew, it spoke of an unearthly rest which would last for ever, and of One who would open an entrance into it. It was, in a certain sense, the profession of a creed. 'In six days the Lord made heaven and 'earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh 'day.' It was an act of submission to the revealed cosmogony; the great Architect of the world, who fainteth not, neither is weary, yet, in a sense, did labour and rest. His people should live under a division of time, which recalled His working and His finished work. Thus the Sabbath shadowed out an office of the Incarnation; it helped to fix the thought of God in the human heart, to connect it with a human standard, to make it in a degree intelligible as well as permanent. But the weekly Sabbath did not stand alone; it was part of a system intertwining itself with the whole Jewish polity. There was also,

——'a seventh-week Sabbath, a seventh-month Sabbath, a seventh-year Sabbath, a seven times seventh-year Sabbath, or year of jubilee. Each of these looked forward to that beyond it: and the last of them all looked forward to the "acceptable year," and to Him who was to appear therein.'—*Ibid.* p. 152.

The Passover, Pentecost, Feast of Tabernacles, and Day of Atonement, were all called Sabbaths. The seventh new moon, or feast of trumpets, was a sort of Sabbath. These Sabbatic observances were supported by penalties and promises. In the seventh year, the nation was to subsist on the spontaneous produce of the uncultivated land. Breaking the Sabbath was a capital offence in the individual. In the nation it was to be followed by 'desolation' of her country.

The Presbyterian Vitringa, and our own Latitudinarian Spencer, appear to have maintained that the Sabbath was passed by the Jew in total inactivity. According to these doctors, bodily and mental exercise, personal and social intercourse, moral and spiritual effort, were alike proscribed. On this theory, Dr. Hessey well observes:—

'Surely it was not designed that the whole machine, so to speak, of Jewish humanity should be stopped, and the pulsations of a mighty nation chilled, even deadened into silence. Such a view has, I firmly believe, no foundation in Scripture. The Israelites were indeed to rest from all labour for subsistence, they were to do no servile work, no fire was to be kindled in their habitations on the Sabbath-day (though this prohibition did not forbid the preparation of what every man must eat, for that might be done by them), they were to carry no burdens, they were to restrain their feet from unnecessary journeys, and to break off their ordinary ways and professions; these points we gather most certainly from Scripture. But the rest was (except on the great day of atonement, which alone was a fast) of the nature of a festival. Men might

eat bread with their friends on that day, as our Saviour's example shows. Men might do works of charity or kindness on that day: His example shows this again.'—*Ibid.* p. 156.

The Sabbath was marked in the ritual by double sacrifices (Num. xxviii. 9). The shewbread was changed, and instruction in the law was imparted, on that day. This latter element, which became so prominent in the synagogue-system of the post-captivity period, seems from the expression, *ἀπὸ γενεῶν ἀρχαίων* (Acts xv. 21, comp. Deut. xxiii. 10; Lev. x. 11, &c.), to have belonged to the Jewish dispensation from the first. This is remarkably confirmed by the question addressed to the Shunamite by her husband, respecting her proposed visit to the prophet Elisha: 'Wherefore wilt thou go to him to-day? It is 'neither new-moon nor Sabbath' (2 Kings iv. 23). The title of one of the Psalms, the ninety-second, reminds us that 'songs 'accompanied by music used to be sung on Sabbaths as on other 'festive occasions.'[1] That Psalm probably opens to us the reflections of a religious Hebrew on the day of national worship. It recognizes the duty of perpetual worship and the value of music as accompanying praise. It glances at the material creation, as suggested by the very fact of the day, and mourns over the 'brutish man' (אִישׁ־בַּעַר) who has no eyes to rise from the contemplation upwards to the uncreated everlasting Creator. The natural world yields images to the moral, which show how intently it had been pondered over, and in what spirit. 'The 'wicked spring as the grass' (ver. 8). 'The righteous flourish 'like a palm tree, and spread abroad like a cedar in Lebanon' (ver. 13). The temple courts are filled with a moral life which rivals the beauty of the vegetable world in its vigour and abundance (ver. 14 שְׁתוּלִים, as in Ps. i. 3 of עֵץ). There is apparently a glance at the other great idea which was natural to the Jew on the Sabbath-day—the deliverance from Egypt:

> 'For, lo, thine enemies, O Lord,
> For, lo, thine enemies shall perish;
> All the workers of iniquity shall be scattered' (ver. 10).

These thoughts would have gathered around the instruction in the law and the psalm-singing, which are probably to be connected with the 'holy convocations,' alluded to in Lev. xxiii. 3; Isa. iv. 5. Here we find the germ of the synagogue, which was peculiarly calculated to give prominence to an institution like the Jewish Sabbath. 'Moses,' observes Josephus, 'permitted 'the people to leave off their other employments, and to assemble

[1] Tholuck Comm. *in loc.* מִזְמוֹר שִׁיר לְיוֹם הַשַּׁבָּת.

'together for the hearing of the law, and the learning it exactly, 'and this, not once, or twice, or oftener, but every week.' Josephus saw the Sabbath through the medium and practical interpretation of its synagogue observance: but the assertion is also true of the earliest period of Jewish history.

We should have expected more frequent allusions to the Sabbath in post-Mosaic history than we find. The paucity of references during this period might explain the parallel silence during the Patriarchal ages, or at least prevent a hasty conclusion from that silence against the primitive institution. During the prophetical period it was largely disregarded. The seventy years' captivity was a punishment for the neglect of the Sabbatical year. The observance or neglect of the Sabbatical year was probably a reflection of the neglect or observance of the Sabbath. The captivity is the turning-point in the history of the Sabbath. The second temple was wanting in those tokens of a supernatural presence which had belonged to the first. The Jews of the two dispersions—the Alexandrian and the Babylonian—required religious organization independent of the new temple, which they could only visit at intervals. There was a profound belief that their national humiliation was traceable to national and personal neglect of the Lord Jehovah. Hence the development of synagogues; it could have existed less easily side by side with the ancient temple. It combined reverence for the Hebrew Scriptures with attention to the Greek or Chaldean vernacular. It satisfied the desire for more frequent assemblies than had been possible before. On the other hand, it was only supplemental to the temple-worship. The temple alone afforded expiation and sacrificial worship: the synagogue supplied prayer and instruction. These latter might well be periodical, the question being one of benefit to those who joined. The former was daily; it touched the honour and prescriptions of Almighty God. But the question arose, How often is the synagogue to be opened? The Sabbath answered that question: Moses was read in the synagogues every Sabbath day. Thus, the Sabbath acquired after the captivity a prominence wholly different from that which was patent to the more ancient Jew, in whose eyes it was distinguished merely by a modification of the daily ritual. Besides, the religious leaders of the restoration, such as Nehemiah, applied themselves with much earnestness to enforce its recognition. A scrupulous observance took the place of the earlier laxity. The festive character of the day vanishes in that of utter, rigid, unbroken rest. In the Maccabæan struggle, a thousand Jews would not attempt a defence against their enemies, because to do so were to break the Sabbath rest. An exception was then allowed in

cases of extreme necessity; but the Roman general, Pompey, obtained possession of Jerusalem, because—

'He argued, and very naturally, that if he employed his army on the Sabbath, not in direct assaults, but in such preparations as should better enable him to attack on the morrow, he should do so without molestation. This method he accordingly adopted, and, by the advantage thus obtained, eventually took the city.—*Ibid.* p. 160.

In the time of our blessed Lord, the Sabbath, like the rest of the Mosaic economy, had been tinged by the Pharisaic spirit and teaching. The Sabbath-day's journey of 2,000 cubits without the city, the exceptions taken against our Lord's works of mercy, and at the act of His disciples who gathered and rubbed the ears of corn, serve to illustrate this spirit. Our Lord, who submitted to circumcision, although sinless, observed also the Mosaic Sabbath, although it recalled subjection to a bondage from which He had Himself redeemed His people. He came not to destroy the law, but to fulfil. He denounced the Pharisaic and Rabbinical additions to the law, which trifled with its letter, and evacuated its spirit. Archbishop Whately, with the customary recklessness of his school, seems to think that our blessed Saviour broke the law of the Sabbath by desiring the impotent man at Bethesda to take up his bed, in contravention of what is apparently enjoined by Jeremiah (xvii. 22, 24), and Nehemiah (xiii. 19). But surely, observes Dr. Hessey—

'He did no more than show His contempt for the Pharisaical gloss upon those passages, which, though originally intended to prevent operations of business, had been strained to apply to such trivial and domestic matters as these.'—*Ibid.* p. 424, note.

Dr. Hessey quotes, from the thirty-nine prohibitions of the Rabbins respecting the Sabbath, two which, however illustrative of the spirit of Rabbinical Judaisim, must have provoked, we should fear, the smiles of an undergraduate audience. 'Grass 'might not be walked on lest it should be bruised, which would 'be a sort of threshing.' 'Nailed shoes may not be worn on the 'Sabbath-day, for this would be to bear a burden.' The heathen estimate of the Jewish Sabbath is an estimate, it should be remembered, of its Rabbinical phase. With Tacitus it is an excuse for indulging national laziness; with Suetonius it is an ascetic observance. Juvenal speaks of it as so much time deducted from the sum of human existence. The horror of asceticism appears in the language of the other heathens, who allude to it as a stronger motive of aversion than the horror of idleness. Dr. Hessey justly remarks upon the confused idea of Jewish history and customs observable in Tacitus. The writer who has left us such a perfect picture of ancient German life, which, in many respects, was further removed than Jewish from

the Roman type of civilization, could not appreciate Judaism. He could not allow for the supernatural element which *must* be taken into account if the Jewish polity was to be understood. The unlikeness of Germany to Judæa was no mere difference between a rude Teutonic and a complex Semitic civilization; the difference lies between what was altogether human and that which was in a great part divine. That the Jewish Sabbath was not meant to be generally binding, we gladly allow; but we are at a loss to conceive Dr. Hessey's meaning when he observes, parenthetically, that even the mistakes of Tacitus seem to show that the Sabbath was a national, not a world-wide institution (p. 161), inasmuch as all who maintain the primitive institution of the Sabbath would admit that it had died out everywhere before the time of Tacitus.

We have not time to examine at greater length Dr. Hessey's very just observations on our Lord's teaching respecting the Sabbath. The point which is most clearly established in these lectures, and for establishing which Dr. Hessey deserves the grateful acknowledgments of the University and the Church, is the following:—

'The Sabbath of the Fourth Commandment, with everything contained under the word Sabbath, or akin to it, days, and times, and years, the strongholds and yet the weaknesses of the law is abolished. It was a positive ordinance of Judaism, and with Judaism has disappeared. But this is without prejudice to the establishment of the Lord's Day, and without its being at all necessary to seek for the Lord's Day, either identity in substance, or directly antitypal connexion with the Sabbath.'—*Ibid.* pp. 169, 170.

Of this conclusion, the former part is abundantly evident from well-known passages and arguments in S. Paul's Epistles. It is not contravened by such texts as the prediction of Isaiah, that (under the Gospel dispensation), 'from one new moon to 'another, and *from one Sabbath to another*, shall all flesh come to 'worship before God.' (Isa. lxvi. 23.) The text proves too much to be of service to the Puritan position. If it is to be construed as making the Sabbath obligatory as a Christian ordinance, it makes the new moon festival not one whit less obligatory. 'No 'less is said of the one than of the other, and, we may add, no 'more.' The passage really points to the unceasing worship of the Catholic Church, whether triumphant before God's throne in heaven, or militant before His altars on earth. Again, our Lord's injunction to his disciples, that they should pray that their flight from Jerusalem might not take place on the Sabbath-day, is thus aptly illustrated by Dr. Hessey, who protests against the Puritan inference that 'the Sabbath-day would exist at the 'destruction of Jerusalem along with all its religious obligations,' for Christians:—

'In a nation like that of the Jews, in which the fiction of the Sabbath-day's journey prevailed extensively, it was no doubt considered wrong to assist the traveller, however urgent his errand, in his movements on the Sabbath-day. All possible impediments, therefore, would be thrown in the way of the fugitives, by those who were still zealous for the supposed requirements of the law. They would render them no aid, they would assail them with obloquy, if with nothing worse, as the violators of the sanctity of the Sabbath. A Roman satirist asserted of the Jews, that they considered it to be their duty—

"Non monstrare vias eadem nisi sacra colenti,
Quæsitum ad fontem solos deducere vespos."

If this were so, they would certainly be yet more uncharitable to those who were, in their eyes, not merely aliens, but apostates; not merely ignorant of their law, but despisers of it, and contributors to its overthrow. What wonder, then, that our blessed Lord, foreseeing that the Sabbath would still exist as a fact, though no longer obligatory as an institution, should have bid His disciples pray that their flight be not cast, not merely in the time of winter, but on a day which would expose them to the yet keener blasts of those who would resent a violation of their ancient day of rest.'—*Ibid.* p. 175.

If Dr. Hessey guards against the Judaism of the Puritan school, which, with the best possible intentions, would utterly undermine the whole argument of S. Paul in the Epistles to the Romans and the Galatians, he does not, therefore, acquiesce in the infinitely more mischievous theory of Dr. Arnold and his followers. The latter agree with the ancients, in holding that the Lord's-day is distinct from the Jewish Sabbath. But they view the Lord's-day as an ordinance which is 'merely ecclesiastical.' As they do not believe in those portions of revelation which imply, or teach, that 'the Church has power to ordain rites and ceremonies, and *authority* in controversies of faith;' they hold very cheap what she may prescribe or teach. They forget, too, that the Lord's-day is not merely an ecclesiastical ordinance, but apostolical. The more advanced members of the school would see, in this circumstance, no reason for a remark or scrupulous obedience. Thus, they press such passages as Gal. iv. 9—11; Col. ii. 16, 17; Rom. xiv. 6; as condemnatory, in principle, of an obligatory Lord's-day. The Puritans have, with singular simplicity, put forward these very passages, from time to time, as condemnatory of the saints'-days and festivals of the Church of Christ, forgetting that such passages do utterly forbid and condemn their own 'Judaizing Sabbath:' and that upon a principle which in no way can affect the ordinances of the Church. Dr. Hessey's treatment of the passages is a happy specimen of the many useful features of his book. We can only afford to extract his remarks on those in the Galatians and Colossians. S. Paul, he observes,

'Is treating entirely of the Jewish law. Not days simply are before his thoughts, but Sabbath-days, festal seasons or times (as the seven days of the Passover),

new moons, Sabbatical months, Sabbatical years, all of them distinctive features of Judaism, are aimed at. He is not thinking, as far as we can gather his thoughts from the context, of anything Christian, but simply protesting against the retention of anything Jewish. The very terms which he uses will not include Christian days, they are essentially Jewish. Nor have we any right to say that analogically days are forbidden under Christianity. Analogy, if it proved or could prove anything, would rather go to show that these days of Judaism, which are confessedly σκιαὶ, or rather parts of a σκιὰ, or dispensation of shadows, *must have their counterparts in corresponding Christian institutions.* It is, however, worth notice that S. Paul, according to his own testimony (1 Cor. xvi. 2), had already urged on the very Galatians whom he desires not to be bound by Jewish days, the performance of the duty of alms giving on a certain Christian day, the first day of the week. He would therefore, so at least it seems to me, have been somewhat inconsistent with himself, had he intended to state in the Epistle to the Galatians, at any rate, that all days are alike under Christianity.'—*Ibid.* pp. 178, 179.

This is not less fatal to the Puritan objection to holy days in general than to the latitudinarian denial of the obligatoriness of the Lord's-day, on the ground of its being at a supposed variance with S. Paul's theological attitude towards Judaism. On the objection against a particular sanctity in the Lord's-day (and we may add in the great festivals of the Church), which proceeds on the idea that such supposed sanctity is inconsistent with the fact that the whole of the Christian's life here is intended to be a perpetual *Sabbatismus*, we have the following very pertinent remarks:—

'Everything that can be urged as to the Sabbatic character of the Christian's life may be admitted: yet such admission is perfectly compatible with the doctrine that upon certain parts or divisions of that life especial light may be thrown. Palestine was the Holy Land; but God chose an especial place, Mount Sion, which He loved and called His Holy Hill. The Temple was all holy; yet there was a Holy of Holies within its precincts. Or to take an analogy of a different character. It is true, for Christ has said it, that God may now be worshipped *anywhere*—that the place to which the tribes used to go up for worship, has no especial claims on the regards of the spiritual Israel. This does not, however, render it unlawful to dedicate certain places to His especial service, or to believe that His especial blessing is shed upon prayers offered therein.'—*Ibid.* p. 183.

In his 'Christianity without Judaism,[1]' the late Professor Powell gives expression to that objection against the Lord's-day, which would be urged by such writers as Mr. F. Newman, or our own Essayists and Reviewers. To have especial times for religion, it is contended, argues a low condition of religion. The Lord's-day is a mere condescension to human weakness. Spiritual Christians should dispense with externalism in all its forms. If religion is to influence the whole life, it must not be confined to certains days. Of late, we have heard a great deal

[1] Essay III. ch. vii. p. 187.

of this kind of proposal to destroy the actual means for living the Christian life, in the name of an unrealized ideal and other sublimities.

'As to the Lord's-day being a condescension to the weakness of human nature, the whole Gospel is such a condescension; that as to religion being liable to be confined to one day, because one day is the Lord's-day, it would be as reasonable to urge, that the spirit of prayer is likely to be lost throughout the remainder of the twenty-four hours, because we dedicate, at morning, at evening, at noon-day, or perhaps oftener, certain especial portions of time to conscious communion with God.'—*Ibid.* p. 184.

The rationalistic spiritualism, we fear, would reply that prayer is merely the indulgence of a sentiment as distinct from the discharge of an obligation. Consequently, it would advise prayer when it was agreeable to pray, and not at other times. This most mischievous and soul-withering idea penetrates, we fear, much further than does the conscious acceptance of theoretic spiritualism. We have heard of 'evangelical' clergymen advising that prayer should be made in private only when the soul is moved to pray. Dr. Hessey's remarks, in his fifth lecture, on the results of what he terms the ecclesiastical theory of the Sunday, are very valuable. He cites Dr. Arnold's often quoted language, to the effect that S. Paul 'fully hoped' that the Lord's-day would be no longer needed.

'It was intended that the Gospel should put us in a very different state, so that we should need the command no more. It was intended so, and S. Paul *fully hoped* that it would be so; and therefore he writes to the Colossians—"Let no man judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holyday, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath-days, which are a shadow of things to come, but the Body is of Christ." Such were his hopes for his fellow-Christians, and to show them that God designed them to be free from this law, the command in its letter was kept no more: the seventh day, the Jews Sabbath, was no longer observed by Christians. But S. Paul's hopes were disappointed; and the gracious designs of God were thwarted. The state of Christians was not changed: the old sickness was not thrown off: and therefore the old remedy was needed.'—*Arnold's Sermons*, iii. p. 260, quoted *Lectures*, p. 188.

Not to mention Dr. Arnold's misapprehension of the relation of the Sabbath-day to the Lord's-day, we would only remark, in this unhappy passage, the germs of that riper unbelief from which the gifted head-master of Rugby was saved by an early death, but with which of late we have become sufficiently familiar; and we are surprised at the deference which Dr. Hessey pays to Arnold's name and opinions, even when he disagrees. Is it deference to a popular name? or the homage due from the present head-master of the Merchant Taylors' School, to the great English schoolmaster of the nineteenth century? For ourselves, we gladly recognize Arnold's great moral strength, as

shown in more than one feature of his life. He has formed an educational ideal for the middle and upper classes in this country, which is now pretty generally accepted. But with the further development of English Rationalism, which there is every reason to anticipate, we may well expect also a corresponding depreciation of that high estimate of Dr. Arnold as a Christian teacher, in which he is at present held by many excellent persons. He, more than any other man of our generation, is responsible for that direction and tone of thought which has just issued in 'Essays and Reviews.' It was his unhappy and unenviable part to render acceptable to religious and educated members of the Church of England principles which were seen in their true and naked hideousness, until he put them forward, graced with the attractions of scholarly refinement, and expressed in the language of a high and disinterested morality. On the above extract, Dr. Hessey observes:—

"The Lord's-day, then, if not contemplated by S. Paul, shows that his judgment was not infallible; that the Gospel, as he left it, was not sufficient; that an addition to Scripture was absolutely necessary. If so, not being supported by Scripture, it has no secure hold upon the conscience of a Christian man—it is not requisite or necessary to salvation."—*Lectures*, p. 188.

In other words, Dr. Arnold neither believes in the sufficiency of Scripture, nor in the infallibility of S. Paul. His theory of the Sunday leads to the direct inference that, with the advance of true religion, it may be dispensed with altogether. From this extreme result he recoils; but Mr. F. W. Robertson carried forward to its logical result the position of Arnold. 'It is possible to attain such an elevation of spirituality as to be independent of stated days for religion altogether.'

The Lord's-day, Dr. Hessey proves, alike from Scripture and the Fathers, to be a strictly apostolical institution. We entirely accept this position. It guards us against the Judaizing theories of the Puritan as well as against the latitudinarian ideas of the continental divines, and of some among ourselves. It invests the day with a sanction which makes it obligatory on serious Christians. We had a little difficulty in arriving at Dr. Hessey's exact meaning, owing to a very unnecessary confusion in his terminology. Christian institutions we had supposed were of three kinds:—divine, apostolical, and ecclesiastical. Dr. Hessey has confused this division, by choosing to include, within the range of the word 'ecclesiastical,' appointments made by the Church in the early apostolic age. He is thus reduced afterwards to speak of the decrees of the post-Apostolic Church as '*purely* ecclesiastical.' Of course the appointments of the Apostolical Church were ecclesiastical appointments. But they were also appointments made by the authority of the Apostles.

This was their special excellence and unshared prerogative: and although the word 'apostolical' may in an entirely lower sense be applied to the Church of succeeding times, we use it of the Church of the first century, as connecting associations which, (in spite of what may have been said to the contrary by Dr. Manning and the late Archdeacon Wilberforce), were believed by the early Church to be incommunicable, and altogether peculiar to itself. In Dr. Hessey's chart of opinions about the Sabbath, which, especially in his first lecture, is elaborated with much detailed minuteness, he is, we think, unintentionally guilty of creating a false impression; by bracketing under the word 'ecclesiastical' some ante-Reformation divines along with our modern latitudinarians. For the practical results of a 'purely ecclesiastical' theory as held by a Roman Catholic and by a continental or English 'Protestant,' would differ most widely. The former, if religious, would see in a precept of the universal Church (even though post-Apostolic) that which was absolutely binding on the conscience. The latter would regard such a precept as historically interesting, but as altogether removed from the sphere of moral obligation. And if Roman Catholic countries have emulated Lutheran Germany in their disregard of the Lord's-day, this is due, not to the authorized teaching of their Church on the subject, but to an unhappy indifference to large portions of revealed truth, among nominally Catholic populations.

The New Testament witness to the Lord's-day—the only witness in Scripture—is the following:—(I.) Our Lord rose on the first day of the week, and appeared on five different occasions. (II.) On the octave of that day, He appeared to the eleven. (III.) The first day of the week was signalized by the descent of the Pentecostal gift. In these facts we see the germ of the observance. They are followed by (IV.) S. Paul's sermon, and the implied practice of the Eucharistic breaking of bread on 'the first day of the week,' at Troas. (Acts xx. 7.) (V.) His precept to the Corinthian and Galatian Churches that, 'upon the first day in the week, everyone should lay by in store 'as God had prospered him,' (1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2,) where, Dr. Hessey well observes, that (1) S. Paul seems to allude to the first day in the week as one already known for the celebration of religious duties, and (2) that the λογία was to be made in the assembly taking place on that day. (VI.) the word ἐπισυναγωγή, in Heb. x. 25, alludes to an existing practice. Multitudes could not assemble regularly, except at some stated time. What stated time would have occurred to the Apostles but the first day of the week? (VII.) S. John was in the Spirit ἐν τῇ Κυριακῇ ἡμέρᾳ, which is (1) not the Sabbath; S. John would have used

the word, nor (2) Easter-day, which is not the oldest meaning of the phrase, nor (3) the Day of Judgment, which seems inconsistent with the reference to Patmos, and the causes which brought the Apostle thither, but (4) the first day of the week, termed 'the Lord's,' as celebrating His resurrection victory, and as devoted to intense communion with Him by His imprisoned servant. (Rev. i.)

Dr. Hessey sums up the result of these passages:—

'So far as we have gone, *the external character* of the Lord's-day at the close of the first century appears to be that of a positive institution of the New Dispensation. It is a day of Christian assembling at short periodic intervals of time, on which certain duties to God, to a man's self, and to his neighbours were performed. This positive institution would seem, both in its essence and in the circumstantials which we have found attached to it, to possess whatever of Divine sanction origination by inspired Apostles can bestow.'—*Lectures*, pp. 52, 53.

We cannot but think that there is an hiatus in the argument. The institution does indeed seem to 'possess whatever of divine 'sanction origination by inspired apostles can bestow.' But why? Because, from the first, the Universal Church practically so understood it. The practice of the Church interprets to us the language of Scripture, and sense of the Apostles. Taking the Scripture passages by themselves, apart from this practice of the body to which they were addressed, or of which they speak, we cannot honestly say that they appear to us to imply a Lord's-day, obligatory as an observance, upon the disciples of our Lord Jesus Christ, to the end of time. Here we see the true account of that strange phenomenon, the upgrowth of the Puritan conception of the Sabbath. The Puritans were determined, at all hazards, to eliminate from their theology the authority of the early Church. They clung to it as long as they could: but it condemned them so plainly, and they were obliged to take such liberties with it, that at last they could not but throw it overboard altogether. They were, happily, untrue to their principle in dealing with the most central mysteries of Christianity, until the logic of Socinianism forced many of them to sacrifice their faith to their consistency. They had given up, at an earlier date, the Church witness to sacraments, and the Episcopate and Church observances; but a religion, however sublimely spiritual its profession, cannot practically get on without some periodical 'days and seasons.' Quakerism, after having eliminated the Sacraments from the Gospel, retains 'the Sabbath.' The Puritans must have felt that the New Testament did not bear them out in saying that the Lord's-day *must* be observed. There is no one explicit precept in the New Testament to this effect. The obligation is

an inference, which, apart from the universal practice of the Church, must seem precarious. This was felt, and in order to rest the weekly observance on an apparently sure and directly-preceptive Scriptural basis, the Puritan divines 'built again the 'things which the Apostles had destroyed,' and maintained the perpetual obligation of the Jewish Sabbath. They were drifting away from Church authority; and we must not criticise too severely their well-meant, though desperate efforts to maintain the scaffolding of Christian life. They felt honestly and keenly the need of strictness and discipline; and as they had made a virtue of repudiating the authority of the Church, they were condemned to the hard necessity of accepting that of the synagogue. They did not comprehend their position; they did not foresee an advancing criticism which would dash from them their newly-chosen supports. They were the victims of a necessity; and while they seemed to be cutting out from the Bible a religion for themselves, they were obeying the law of theological declension. The Gracchi complaining of sedition were consistency itself compared with a school of theologians which objected to the Church of Christ that she was Judaic in maintaining observances which had nothing in the world to do with Judaism, while they themselves were busily employed in contravening, by their observance of the Mosaic Sabbath, the very spirit, arguments, and letter of the Apostle, whereby Judaizing error was for ever condemned.

And if the observance of the Lord's-day is to be seriously maintained—if we are not to clutch, like drowning men, at a spar which will be presently washed from under us by the next wave of critical inquiry—we must honestly and fearlessly say, that the evidence for the observance of the Lord's-day is incomplete without the witness of the Church. If it be replied, that this is a premiss which the Puritan school will never admit into the realm of doctrinal truth, we rejoin, that they cannot, if they would, make Bible evidences stronger than they are, or really fortify Christian observances by theories which are certainly as modern as they are apparently most unreliable. Nay, more. If any serious reply is to be made to the modern Rationalistic school, the witness of the Church, which is a necessary complement to a large cycle of admitted practices and doctrines, must not only be honestly admitted, but earnestly insisted on, as an integral element of the discussion. Apart from this witness, we admit that the passages in Scripture which prove the doctrine of Eucharistic sacrifice (as Malachi i. 11; in Heb. xiii. 10, and probably Matt. v. 23, the reference to the altar; the word ποιεῖτε in the institution, &c.), might hardly avail to do so. Apart from it, the texts which are appealed to on

behalf of a visible Church, apostolical succession, episcopacy, Eucharistic consecration, the reality of the priesthood under the Gospel as under the law, might seem inadequate. Granted. But the witness of the Church is not less necessary to those who fancy that they can be good Christians, and yet dispense with it, than to ourselves, who admit and rejoice in its support and its necessity. Apart from this witness, is there, we would ask, any sanction of infant baptism so cogent as to counterbalance what may be urged against it? Apart from this witness, where is the main strength of the Gospel prohibition of polygamy? The personality of the Holy Ghost, original sin, the inspiration of the New Testament, and other solemn and certain truths, do, as a matter of fact, rest on the same sort of Scripture evidence as that which is producible on behalf of the details of the sacramental system of the Church. The direct evidence of single passages in either case is small: the inferential results of many passages is large in the case of all of these doctrines. So with the Lord's-day. The New Testament does not tell us that God has hallowed it. The Old Testament does tell us that God hallowed the seventh day—yet we now observe the first. The New Testament witnesses to such an observance in the apostolic age: it does not enjoin it, in terms, upon succeeding ages. It does not say, in detail, how the Apostles observed it, or how we are to observe it. It records an event which might well invite a weekly commemoration. It tells us that one weekly recurrence of this commemoration was marked by an appearance of our risen Lord, and another, by the descent of the Holy Co-Eternal Spirit. An Apostle marks it by a celebration of the Eucharist in one portion of the world, and desires that it may be marked by a collection of alms for the poor in another. If a gathering together of Christians is referred to in an Apostolic Epistle, we have difficulty in supposing that this can have meant anything else than that on the Lord's-day. If S. John has a vision, he dates it by an expression which admits of no other explanation so easily as that which refers it to the Lord's-day. Such is the Scripture evidence, incomplete, we feel, and not equal to sustain the weight of moral obligation which is held to rest on it until it is remembered that, side by side with the letter of Scripture, we have the universal practice of the Church, each member of which was already instructed by sight and ear in this apostolical precept, as an integral part of his profession of Christianity, so as to have made more explicit written commands unnecessary. The practice of the Church gives point to what else might seem pointless in Scripture, and invests with their true importance expressions which else might seem trivial

or incidental, and brings out the inner combination and unity of purpose which belongs to passages which would otherwise seem to be disconnected and divergent. Allusions which may stimulate but can never satisfy conjecture, are explained, when we recollect that they are only allusions, because they run parallel to a living interpretation, and because the Church, like Scripture, was to be continuous. If the words of Christ were not to pass away, those holy words had witnessed that against His Church the gates of hell were not to prevail.

Remembering these and like considerations, to which Dr. Hessey has not done justice, we note with pleasure his reference to the language of the ante-Nicene fathers. They exhibit the stream of apostolic tradition, flowing forth into Christian history. While the Pagan Pliny speaks of a stated day of Christian observance marked by a *sacramentum*, S. Ignatius denounces 'Sabbatizing' as inconsistent with 'living according to the Lord's life;' and the Epistle ascribed, with whatever truth, to S. Barnabas, exclaims, 'We celebrate the eighth day with joy (εἰς εὐφροσύνην), in which Jesus rose from the dead.' S. Justin Martyr condemns 'Sabbatizing,' contrasts Saturday with Sunday, urges the creation of light and the resurrection of our Lord as reasons for observing the Lord's-day, and describes the celebration of the blessed Eucharist, the prayers and alms which marked it. How precious, did we but possess it, would be that lost treatise of S. Melito of Sardis—ὁ περὶ τῆς κυριακῆς λόγος! (Eus. H. E. iv. 26.) Later in the second century, S. Irenæus insists on the symbolical character of the Jewish Sabbath, alludes to the habit of *standing* while praying on the Sunday, and urges the practice of the Church respecting the Lord's-day as decisive of the question at issue between the Westerns and the Quartodecimans. Here the double tradition respecting the Easter commemoration of the Resurrection contrasts sharply with the uniform and unvarying practice of the Church in commemorating the Resurrection on the Lord's-day. In S. Clement of Alexandria, the 'true gnostic' spiritualizes the decalogue; but the Lord's-day is mentioned as a contemporary fact. Tertullian draws out the symbolism of the Jewish Sabbath. It figures man's rest from sin, and his final rest in God. But, 'we 'have,' he says, 'nothing to do with Sabbaths and other Jewish 'festivals'. . . . . We have our 'own solemnities, the Lord's-day, 'for instance'. . . . . We consider 'it wrong to fast on the Lord's-'day, or to pray, kneeling, during its continuance.' Also, 'we 'put off our worldly business, lest we give any place to the 'devil.' Here Neander detects, as he thinks, indications of a 'transfer of the Jewish law of the Sabbath to the Lord's-day.' The criticism, as applied to Tertullian, is about as rational as if

we were to accuse Mr. Bright of aristocratic tendencies. Tertullian witnesses incidentally to the apostolical practice of the Church. To much the same purpose, Origen and S. Cyprian. We do not find in these writers much formal argument. The observance is not based on arguments from general agreement or expediency, or appeals to passages in the New Testament. A fact is recorded: there is no effort, nothing but artless and unaffected simplicity, while they describe the practice of the sub-Apostolic Church. There was no necessity for making earnest appeals in favour of Sunday observance. 'It is a mark,' observed Origen, 'of a perfect Christian to keep the Lord's-day.' The world was then without the Church, persecuting and pagan: it had not, as yet, under the edicts of the successors of Constantine, passed within. To be a Christian was to look forward to much worldly suffering and possibly a violent death. The celebration of the divine mysteries, although by no means confined to the Lord's-day, was, from the first, an essential or, rather, the leading feature of its observance. Then, at His altar, the whole body of the faithful met their Lord. There they received from the Source of Life strength, consolation, refreshment. They lived a life of sympathy with the all-holy life of Christ, too close and perfect to render it necessary that they should be reminded of their *duty* of observing His Resurrection festival. Dr. Hessey explains the omission of the enforcement of rest on the Lord's-day, on the part of the early writers, as follows: —

'They realized very perfectly, I believe much more perfectly than we do, the Humanity of our Blessed Lord, and their own participation in His nature as the Son of Man. Hence, remembering that He "was wearied and sat by the well," the worshippers of the Son of Man, so far as they could, rested on His own day with Him.'—*Ibid.* p. 71.

He notes, in the post-Nicene Fathers, a different tone in discussing the subject. It had become necessary to warn Christians of the necessity of observing the Lord's-day. This is not due to the edict of Constantine or to any supposed development in a Judaizing direction. The world had rushed within the Church; and the Church had to speak not as in earlier years to affectionate and devoted children, but to populations whose allegiance to Christianity was often a matter of fear or fashion. Who can wonder that she altered her tone, and that she spoke of duty when she would rather have quickened love? S. Athanasius and Eusebius however, distinguish, after the ante-Nicene fashion, between the Sabbath and the Lord's-day: Eusebius eulogises Constantine for making the Lord's-day imperative. S. Macarius, of Egypt, treats the Jewish Sabbath in the spiritualizing temper, almost in the words of S. Justin. S. Cyril, of Jerusalem, warns his catechumens to reject not

observance of Sabbaths. S. Hilary of Poictiers expounds the 92d Psalm of the Eternal Sabbath of the next life. S. Epiphanius points out that the Sabbath was broken by the act of circumcision, the temple sacrifices, and the compassing about of Jericho. S. Ambrose makes a metaphorical application of the term Sabbatum to the Lord's-day. This language does not differ from that of the ante-Nicene period. But Dr. Hessey is on the look-out for the cloven foot: by this time the Church ought to be developing in a Judaistic direction. So if S. Gregory of Nyssa happens to call the Sabbath and the Lord's-day, ἀδελφαὶ ἡμεραὶ (an expression which need not imply, nay, which excludes, Sabbatarian views), Dr. Hessey remarks on 'the spurious honour now beginning to be attributed to the Sabbath.' (P. 96.) To say nothing of SS. Basil and Gaudentius, S. Jerome writes in the ante-Nicene spirit. When a boy at Rome, he spent and enjoyed his Sundays in roaming through the catacombs. On Puritan principles he ought to have reflected in later life on his godless Sabbath-breaking. But, instead of doing this, he dwells with vivid pleasure on these Sunday recreations, and quotes Virgil to illustrate his impressions of scenes with which the grotesque narrative of an Oxford traveller has lately rendered the readers of the *Guardian* a little familiar. We must refer our readers to Dr. Hessey's Third Lecture, for the remaining Fathers of this period and for the Imperial Legislation on the subject which marked the close of the fourth and the beginning of the fifth century.

Dr. Hessey characterizes the period in the following terms:—

'Insensibly, in part from dependence upon secular aid and imitation of secular legislation (which must be universal in its terms and stringent in the enforcements of its commands), and in part from the profession of Christianity being now attended with no danger; rest, though emphatically a Christian rest, is beginning to be insisted upon, attendance at Divine worship, heretofore a service of love, is enforced by ecclesiastical penalties, and frequenting of irregular assemblies is discouraged in a similar manner. It has been found necessary to forbid Christians to appear at heathen public games, so long as they are allowed on the Lord's-day. And the civil power has consented to close the law courts, and forbidden, at any rate in towns, a man's public pursuit of his calling; it has at length put down the scandal of such games as were offensive and a snare to Christians, on that day. In all these respects, a certain change is observable, and therefore I call these two centuries the commencement of a new era in the history of the Lord's-day. But with all this, in no clearly genuine passage that I can discover in any writer of these two centuries, or in any public document ecclesiastical or civil, is the Fourth Commandment referred to as the ground of the obligation to observe the Lord's-day. In no passage, too, is there anything like a reference to the Creation words, as the ground of the obligation to observe it, with the exception perhaps of that one passage in Chrysostom in which the command for the seventh day is made *αἰνιγματωδῶς* to shadow forth the command for the first. In no passage is there anything like the confusion between "the seventh day," and "one day in seven," of which we have heard so much in England since

A.D. 1595. In no passage is there any hint of the transfer of the Sabbath to the Lord's-day, or of the planting of the Lord's-day on the ruins of the Sabbath, those fictions of modern times. If the Sabbath appears, it appears as a perfectly distinct day.'—*Ibid*, pp. 113—115.

Between the sixth and the fifteenth centuries, Dr. Hessey remarks 'a more serious change.'

'Thus a gradual identification of the Lord's-day with the Sabbath sets in. This naturally leads to the Fourth Commandment. The Fourth Commandment once thought of, vexatious restrictions follow, thwarting men in their necessary employments or enjoyments by an application of its terms either strictly literal or most ingeniously refined. Councils condescend to notice whether "oxen may or may not be yoked on the Lord's-day," and not unfrequently contradict each other. The Second Council of Macon, A.D. 585, enjoins, "that no one should allow himself on the Lord's-day, under plea of necessity, to put a yoke on the necks of his cattle; but all be occupied with mind and body in the hymns and the praise of God. For this is the day of perpetual rest; this is shadowed out to us by the seventh day in the law and the prophets." It then goes on to threaten punishments for profanation of the holy day either by pleading causes or by other works.'—*Ibid*, pp. 116, 117.

That there are instances of identification of the Lord's-day with the Sabbath, during these centuries, we readily admit. Dr. Hessey's instances from Alcuin and Tostatus are in point. Archbishop Chichele appears, on one occasion, to have used language on the subject of Sunday observance, which, prior to knowledge of its authorship, we should have ascribed to Archbishop Sumner. Bellarmine overstates the analogical use of the Old Testament. (Mr. Baden Powell, indeed, is not precisely the one writer whom we should have chosen to paraphrase the mind of Bellarmine. But there is no accounting for tastes. Dr. Hessey feels safer with both than with one.) But there is abundant evidence that the Church never committed herself to the Judaizing theory: and Dr. Hessey supplies authorities (to which more might be added) which show that the apostolical, anti-Judaic character of the day was not lost sight of. S. Gregory the Great, Nicholas I., the Emperor Leo the Philosopher, our own Archbishops Islip of Canterbury and Neville of York, illustrate the continuity of Church teaching. And Dr. Hessey does not, we think, deal altogether fairly with the Churchmen of those ages. The Church could not treat the converted barbarians as she had treated her children of the first three centuries. The fervent love of the primitive period could make rule and detailed precepts unnecessary. But the dim perceptions of truth on the part of vast multitudes, often inadequately provided for as regards spiritual training, and belonging to a lower and distinct sphere of spiritual attainment, obliged her to say exactly what must be done or left undone, if the institutions of the Apostles were to be obeyed. A neglect of this, and parallel

considerations, leads Neander to indulge in the absurd diatribes about the 'Externalisation of Christian Doctrine, &c.' which makes his Church history so wearisome to a Catholic-minded and intelligent reader. The Church of the Middle Ages had her faults, no doubt. But we, of this day and generation, are not men whose hands are sufficiently clean, even on the subject of Sunday observance, to hold hard language of ages which were distinguished by a tender and courageous charity for souls, of which we have, probably, little idea. If the Church of the Middle Ages was asked for rules by the voices or needs of her children, she gave them: in giving them on the subject of Sunday, she used the Sabbath *analogically*, as supplying principles: her doctors may at times have run analogy upwards towards identification, but, on the whole, her theory and practice was in no sense a justification of the irreligious excesses of those Wallenses and Anabaptists whom (we hope without knowing very much in detail about them) Dr. Hessey thinks it right to take under his especial patronage.

The Sixth Lecture on the Opinions of the Continental Protestants, although hardly edifying, if considered as a sermon, is full of interesting historical matter. Dr. Hessey justly observes of the Continental Reformers, 'that they trenched in various particulars upon what was Apostolical and Divine,' page 219. This euphemism means the destruction of the organic and vital structure of Christ's Holy Catholic Church—neither less nor more. Luther's coarse and characteristic language might be noted with advantage by some among ourselves, who make much of his name, while knowing little, except upon one or two points, of his real opinions:—

'If anywhere,' he says, 'the day is made holy for the mere day's sake,—if anywhere any one sets up its observance on a Jewish foundation, then I order you to work on it, to ride on it, to dance on it, to feast on it, to do anything that shall remove this encroachment on Christian liberty.'—*Luther's Table Talk*, quoted *Ibid.* p. 222.

Luther's Larger Catechism teaches that 'no day is better or 'more excellent than another,' and that 'the object of the Re-'formers in retaining the Lord's-day' was the 'securing una-'nimity and consent of arrangement.' The Augsburg Confession teaches that 'those who judge that in the place of the Sabbath 'the Lord's-day was instituted as a day to be necessarily ob-'served, are greatly mistaken.' So much for Melancthon. In the next generation, Chemnitz 'charged the Romanists with 'superstition, because they taught an inherent sanctity in the 'Lord's-day.' Bucer remarks that 'to think that working on 'the Lord's-day is in itself a sin, is a superstition, and a deny-'ing of the grace of Christ.' Calvin teaches the abrogation of

the Sabbath, therein agreeing with the Catholic Church: he differs from her in his theory that the observance of the first day of the week, or of one day in seven, are matters of indifference. The Helvetic Confesssion complacently observes, 'We do not 'believe either that one day is more sacred than another, or 'that mere rest is, in itself, well-pleasing to God.'

Dr. Bownd's work, which formalized the theory of the Puritanic Sabbath in England, introduced that theory into Holland. At the Synod of Dort, the latitudinarianism of the Reformers came into collision with the Judaism of the Puritans. Bishop Carlton, of Llandaff, who was present at the Synod, gives the result of his experience in South Wales, of the relative value of coercive and hortatory efforts to promote Sunday observance:—

'An inquiry was made in what manner persons were compelled in other countries to go to church, and "keep the whole Sabbath as they ought?" He replied, "that in *his* country the civil magistrate set a fine or pecuniary penalty upon those who forbore coming to Divine Service according to their duty;" and (he added with great *nāiveté*), "that such fine wrought much more on the people than any the most pious exhortations."'—*Ibid.* p. 233.

Subsequently, the Sabbatarian views were generally embraced as a refuge from the irreligion of the earlier theory of the German Protestants. In Mosheim, they are checked by his antiquarian knowledge: in Spener, they are passing into a subjective principle: 'he rested the argument for the Lord's-day on the 'experience of those who have tasted its blessedness.' Such arguments are not calculated to win general acceptance: and Spener's Pietism opened the door to the unbelief and indifferentism which followed. The traveller in Northern Germany may remark the action of the destructive rationalism, following upon Sabbatarian or lax theories of earlier ages, in nothing more markedly than the total neglect of the day of our Lord's Resurrection by the masses of the people.

We should like to follow Dr. Hessey in his remarks upon the English history of the doctrine, as also into the important question of the principle upon which our Church uses the Fourth Commandment in her Communion Service. But we content ourselves, though most unwillingly, with one or two graphic passages. During the reign of Queen Elizabeth, the Lord's-day was not, it appears, carefully observed.

'There seems to have been a great forgetfulness of its religious character. In one of the Queen's injunctions Sunday is classed with other holidays, and it is expressly said, that "if for any scrupulosity or grudge of conscience some should superstitiously abstain from working on those days, they shall grievously offend." In fact, labour was almost enjoined after common prayer. On the same principle, we find the Queen "granting a license to one John Seconton, to use certain plays and games upon nine several Sundays." After a time, in

A.D. 1580, the London magistracy obtained from her an interdiction of this practice on Sundays within the liberties of the City. Elsewhere it was carried on; and the pictures of the Sunday recreations of the period which have come down to us, though somewhat profusely colored, indicate a low tone of feeling on the subject of the Holy Day.'—*Ibid*, pp. 270, 271.

Dr. Hessey quotes Strype, as illustrating the popular shapes variously assumed by the theories of Dr. Bownd, the chief originator of the Puritanical Sabbath:—

'"It was preached in Oxfordshire, (says that writer) that to do any work on the Sabbath was as great a sin as to kill or to commit adultery. It was preached in Somersetshire, that to throw a bowl on the Sabbath-day was as great a sin as to commit murder. It was preached in Norfolk, that to make a feast or wedding dinner on that day was as great a sin as for a father to take a knife and cut his son's throat. It was preached in Suffolk, (and my author saith that he could name the man,) that to ring more bells than one on the Lord's-day, to call the people to Church, was as great a sin as to do an act of murder." '—*Ibid*, pp. 278, 279.

Take, again, the following specimen of the tender mercies of Puritan legislation in Massachusetts:—

'Whosoever shall profane the Lord's-day by doing unnecessary work, by unnecessary travelling, or by sports and recreations, he or they who so transgress shall forfeit forty shillings, or be publicly whipped; but if it shall appear to have been done presumptuously, such person or persons shall be put to death, or otherwise severely punished at the discretion of the court.

'No one shall run on the Sabbath-day, or walk in his garden, or elsewhere, except reverently to and from meeting.

'No one shall travel, cook victuals, make beds, sweep house, cut hair, or shave on the Sabbath-day.'—*Ibid.* p. 285.

Or in Scotland:—

'In the year 1644, the "Six Sessions" ordained public intimation to be made, that "no person, man nor woman, shall be found vaging, walking, and going upon the streets upon the Lord's-day after the afternoon's sermon, keeping idle, and entertaining impertinent conferences." In the next year, the same court ordered that "the magistrates, attended by the ministers by course, shall go up and down the streets upon the Lord's-day after the afternoon sermon, and cause take particular notice of such as shall be found forth of their houses vaging abroad upon the streets, and cause cite them before the Session to be rebuked and censured." And on the 5th of April, A.D. 1658, this direction was issued:—"The magistrates to cause some English soldiers go along the streets, and those outparts above written, both before sermon and after sermon, and lay hold upon both young and old whom they find out of their houses or out of the Church."

'My fourth instance shall be taken from the records of the Presbytery of Strath-bogie, June 6, A.D. 1658:—"The said day, Alexander Cairnie, in Tilliochie, was delaitit for brak of Sabbath, in bearing ane sheep upon his back from the pasture to his own house. The said Alexander compeirit and declarit that it was of necessitie for saving of the beast's lyfe in tyme of storme. Was rebukit for the same, and admonished not to do the lyke." '—*Ibid.* pp. 290, 291.

Or again, at the present day:—

'A few words written by an intelligent resident in Scotland, will convey come idea of that strictness. "Here (he says), it is wrong to touch the piano, even for the most sacred music, on Sunday; it is wrong to take a walk,

even between the services. One distinguished member of the Free Kirk openly avows his wish to see the interference of the police to prevent such a desecration of the day. At a recent meeting of the Presbyters and Lay Elders of the largest non-conforming body in Scotland—the United Presbyterians—some one expressed his horror that 'on the evening of the Lord's-day he found a Protestant minister walking with his wife on the ramparts of Strasbourg. That stroll was a miserable adoption of the Continental Sunday.' In many places a person can only preserve his credit as an observer of the Lord's-day, and obtain the indulgence of a walk, by frequenting a Church as distant from his own dwelling as his walking powers will allow; and (he adds), the extreme severity which is enforced out of doors produces very often a system of covert laxity." Such a Sunday as this, many who held the Sabbatarian theory felt themselves bound to introduce into England.'—*Ibid.* p. 300.

The closing lecture is devoted to the practical and important question to which all the earlier ones lead. How are we to spend Sunday? We should like to touch upon the many grave and interesting topics which are handled in the course of answering this question. But our chief duty to Dr. Hessey and to his readers is to express our surprise that in his eager desire to popularise the religious observance of Sunday, Dr. Hessey has thought it consistent with his duty to advocate the novel practice of evening celebrations of the Holy Communion. This advocacy is not confined to an incidental passage in the text of his eighth lecture. In a somewhat elaborate note (pp. 483—495), of twelve pages in small type, Dr. Hessey explains to us the reasons which induce him to agree with Mr. T. P. Rowsell, of Stepney, and Dr. Miller, of Birmingham, upon a point of grave importance, wherein those gentlemen, with whose theological acquirements we are not acquainted, have the misfortune to be opposed categorically to the explicit teaching of fathers, so reverenced alike in the formularies, and by the great divines of the Church of England, as are S. Chrysostom and S. Augustine.

Dr. Hessey, evidently while engaged in writing this note, has before him an article which appeared in this Journal on the subject of 'Evening Communions' in July, 1860.[1]

'It is (says Dr. H.) usually acknowledged by the upholders [of the duty of celebrating in the early part of the day], that for some time at least the Church did not make any rule whatever on the subject: an admission which seems almost to settle the allegation of primitive practice.'—P. 485.

A rule may be (1) either instinctive and traditional, or (2) explicit and written. There was no need of a written rule in the earliest times. The practice of the Church, we fearlessly say, was universal, from Apostolic times. That universal practice was the rule; and it was in favour only of early celebrations. The admission, then, does settle the question of primitive

[1] Dr. Hessey alludes to the Article in his notes, p. 362, on the subject of the *ἀγαπαί*. He combats its language in some points, but makes no direct reference there.

practice, although not in the way contemplated by the Bampton Lecturer.

We are glad that Dr. Hessey recognizes the Holy Eucharist in the *sacramentum* of Pliny. This satisfaction is diminished when we find him asking with Neander whether the early (ante lucem) Communion was a matter of religion at all, and not rather a matter of necessity. This argument looks well, especially when it is read amidst the late hours for rising and the bright gas-lit evenings of a modern English town. In England, no doubt, the early morning would be the time for secrecy. Not, so, however, we apprehend, in the East, at the close of the first and the beginning of the second century. Not so, in parts of the continent of Europe, which we need not name to a traveller of Dr. Hessey's experience. Dr. Hessey justly describes the Cyprianic Aquarii as 'cowards in act, rather than heretics in principle, pp. 485, 486. And his proof is that they would only use wine in the Eucharist *in the evening:* in the morning it would have betrayed them. If this was so in Africa, why not in Asia Minor? Can we doubt that those early celebrations described by Pliny exhibit a deference to the authority of the Church, as guided by S. John, which positively risked, rather than promoted, the personal safety of its members?

Of the three passages cited from Tertullian, Dr. Hessey prudently observes, '*I do not dwell on them*' (p. 485). And then, afterwards, he speaks of '*Tertullian being set aside as not in point*' (p. 487). This is certainly a *naïve* method of dealing with authorities which happen to stand in the way of a popular but mischievous theory. Tertullian, like Cyprian and Augustine, fully recognizes the contrast between the circumstances of our Lord's institution of the Eucharist and the actual practice of the Church of his own day, which celebrated *in antelucanis cœtibus.* (De Cor. 3.) He tells us that, on the Station-Days, some Christians hesitated to communicate, lest they should break the Station Fast, which ended at 3 P.M. (De Orat. 19.) Once more. In the Ad Uxorem, ii. 5, he speaks of that 'Bread' which was tasted '*ante omnem cibum.*' Dr. Hessey gets over Tertullian by simply ignoring him. Yet it is not military wisdom to push forward into an enemy's country, and leave strong fortresses untaken in the rear. However, Dr. Hessey leaves a corps of observation. 'The notes,' he says, 'in Rigaltius' edition are worth consulting.' We had read those notes. If Dr. Hessey had read more of them, he would probably have recommended them less decidedly. He would have agreed with a French critic who quietly remarks that the notes of Rigault, in his edition of Tertullian, 'servent souvent moins à éclaircir le texte, qu'à établir les opinions particulières du scholiaste.' Rigault, in fact

maintained opinions which Dr. Hessey, we are certain, would not endorse. His love of paradox is exhibited in other matters. His theory that our Lord was deformed, which appears in his notes on Tertullian, and in a dissertation at the end of his edition of S. Cyprian, was learnedly answered in a work of the Jesuit, Vavasseur, *De Forma Christi.* Paris, 1649. As to the Eucharist, Rigault maintained, that 'laymen have a right to consecrate it in cases of necessity, when they cannot have recourse to ministers of the Church.' This opinion would be acceptable enough to English non-conformists, but not, we suppose, to Dr. Hessey. It was formally refuted by l'Aubespine, the learned Bishop of Orleans, and we must do Rigault the justice to say that he retracted it. Still, enough has been said to render it doubtful whether his notes are trustworthy guides to the mind of Tertullian, on the subject of the Eucharist.

Dr. Hessey places S. Cyprian in the 'latter half' of the third century. This is so far true, that S. Cyprian was martyred in A.D. 258. We take leave to observe that Dr. Hessey misrepresents S. Cyprian, in whom he fancies that he discovers some sanction for the practices of S. Peter's Stepney, and S. Martin's Birmingham. It is so far from clear that the evening meetings at which the Aquarii used wine were in any sense a celebration of the Eucharist, that the contrary appears certainly demonstrable. It was a kind of private Agapè rite, or perhaps an offering up to God of the wine of the 'mixed cup' which they were about to drink at their ordinary supper, and which appears to have been welcomed by the Aquarii as a stop-gap for the consciences of those who were unsatisfied with the mere use of water at the altar in the morning. We spoke of this indeed as '*their* manner of celebration,' '*their* evening celebrations;' but that in fact it was not the Eucharist seems to be implied by S. Cyprian's phrase, 'sacramenti veritatem,' and is proved by the marked contrast of the expression 'Dominicum celebrare' in the following clause. But why, we would ask, did the Aquarii pretend to celebrate in the morning at all, when they were afraid to use anything but water? There is only one answer to this question. So strong and so definite was the tradition of the Church, that to celebrate without the essential matter of the sacrament in the morning, appeared to these men a less evil than no morning celebration at all, or than an evening celebration. When indeed, at last, they were driven to plead that in order to celebrate the Eucharist with all its essential elements, they must (after our Lord's example) do so after supper, they were told that 'we celebrate in the morning.' S. Cyprian's reply was (1) that the Church celebrated in the morning, in accordance with the time of our Lord's Resurrection; and (2)

that at this morning celebration as often as celebrated (quoticscunque) they should use wine as well as water. In saying that S. Cyprian was pleading for a 'mixed chalice' ('in which our 'Church has not thought proper to follow him') Dr. Hessey is guilty of a slight fallacy. S. Cyprian was not pleading for adding water to wine, but for adding wine to water. Dr. Hessey concludes triumphantly, 'There is not the slightest hint 'in Cyprian's argument of an obligation to morning celebration 'exclusively.' We assert, on the contrary, that there is the strongest possible implication of this 'obligation to morning 'celebration exclusively.' The practice of the Church is stated, without comment, as Dr. Hessey has observed in the parallel case of the Lord's-day observance during the ante-Nicene period. This is assuredly the strongest way of implying that that practice was obligatory. It is enough for the members of any society to be informed of its practice. They do not seek, as they would not generally be favoured with, an additional dissertation on the grounds of the obligation.[1]

[1] It may be best to relegate a minute discussion on this passage to a note. The practice against which S. Cyprian is writing appears to have existed for some time in portions of the African Church. He attributes the origin of it not to cowardice, but to ignorance and simplicity. After general arguments against it, he states the pleas of those who practised it. I. That it was a custom received from those who preceded them. II. That by means of it they were not discovered to be Christians from the smell of wine early in the day. Then follow two pleas contained in the passage in question. S. Cyprian says:—

'An illa sibi aliquis contemplatione blanditur, quod etsi mane aqua sola offerri videtur, tamen cum ad cœnandum venimus, mixtum calicem offerimus? Sed cum cœnamus, ad convivium nostrum plebem convocare non possumus, ut sacramenti veritatem fraternitate omni præsente celebremus. At enim non mane, sed post cœnam mixtum calicem obtulit Dominus. Numquid ergo Dominicum post cœnam celebrare debemus, ut sic mixtum calicem frequentandis Dominicis offeramus? Christum offerre oportebat circa vesperam diei, ut hora ipsa sacrificii ostenderet occasum et vesperam mundi, sicut in Exodo scriptum est: Et occident illum omne vulgus synagogæ filiorum Israel ad vesperam. Et iterum in Psalmis: Allevatio manuum mearum sacrificium vespertinum. Nos autem resurrectionem Domini mane celebramus. Et quia passionis ejus mentionem in sacrificiis omnibus facimus—passio est enim Domini sacrificium, quod offerimus—nihil aliud, quam quod ille fecit, facere debemus. Scriptura enim dicit: Quotiescunque enim ederitis panem istum et calicem istum biberitis, mortem Domini annuntiabitis, quoadusque veniat. Quotiescunque ergo calicem in commemorationem Domini et passionis ejus offerimus, id, quod constat Dominum fecisse, faciamus.'

Here, it will be observed, there are two distinct points advanced by the Aquarians: *a.* That they do offer wine (with water) when they come to supper. *b.* That the time of the Communion ought to be altered, and the celebration be made after supper. We will add our own translation of the words, marking in inverted commas the allegations of the Aquarii. Only we will premise that the word Dominicum is used—*α.* Of the Lord's-day. *β.* Of the Lord's Feast (the Eucharist). *γ.* Of the Lord's House. In a well-known passage in the treatise De Opere et Eleemosyna, the word is used of the Eucharist and the Church in two consecutive clauses; Locuples et dives es, et *Dominicum celebrare* te credis, quæ corbonam omnino non respicis; quæ in Dominicum sine sacrificio venis; quæ partem de sacrificio, quod pauper obtulit, sumis? There can be no doubt that in the passage before

Dr. Hessey admits that S. Chrysostom and S. Augustine are against him. S. Chrysostom exclaims, 'If I have done any 'such thing as administer to persons, excepting fasting, may my 'name be blotted out of the roll of Bishops!' The logic of Dr. Hessey's commentary on this language is singular. 'It defeats 'its purpose,' he urges, 'by its very exaggeration.' The major premiss of Dr. Hessey's syllogism must be as follows: 'All 'persons who use exaggerated language upon a subject must 'be held to say nothing whatever upon that subject.' The 'exaggerated' language of S. Chrysostom, as well as the charge which provoked it, can leave no doubt as to the practice and sentiments of his age. In S. Augustine's language there is

---

us Dominicum means the Eucharist: and Gersdorf notes that Dominicis means the same, and that *Dominicum celebrare* and *frequentare* are equivalent. The classical use of *frequentare* in the sense of solemnizing, or celebrating, is familiar to scholars.

'Does any one flatter himself with the thought,' (this was the third plea,) 'that although in the morning, water only seems to be offered, yet when we come to supper we offer a mixed cup?' 'But, when we sup,' S. Cyprian replies, 'we cannot call together the people to our banquet, so as to celebrate the *reality of the Sacrament* in the presence of all the brethren. But it may be said' (their last argument), 'that it was not in the morning, but after supper, that the Lord offered the mixed cup. Ought we not, therefore, to celebrate the Lord's Feast after supper, that so we may offer the mixed cup in solemnizing the Lord's Feast?' 'It was right' (is the answer of Cyprian), 'that Christ should offer towards the eventide, that the very hour of the Sacrifice might show forth the decline and evening of the world (as it is written in Exodus: "And all the congregation of the children of Israel shall kill it in the evening." And again, in the Psalms: "Let the lifting up of my hand be an evening sacrifice"): but *we celebrate the Resurrection of the Lord in the morning.* And because,' he concludes, 'we make mention of His Passion in all our sacrifices (for the Passion of the Lord is the Sacrifice which we offer) we ought to do nothing else than what He did. For the Scripture says: "*As often* as ye eat that bread and drink that cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till He come." 'As often, therefore, as we offer the cup in commemoration of the Lord and of His Passion, let us do that which it is certain the Lord did,' *i. e.* offer wine.

Now we think it will appear very plainly that the mixed cup offered at the cœna was not the Eucharist. The language, 'when we come to sup'—'at supper' seems to suggest the idea of an ordinary meal: and the action is contrasted with 'celebrating the reality of the Sacrament in the presence of all the brethren.' But all doubt seems to be removed by the words that follow: where the Aquarii, driven from the subterfuge of the 'wine offered at supper,' urge that the 'Lord's Feast,' the '*Dominicum* ought to be celebrated after supper.' It seems plain that the cup they offered at supper could not be maintained to be a '*celebratio Dominici*.' And the answer of S. Cyprian seems most simply decisive of the point now at issue: 'We celebrate in the morning.' The practice of the Church in this matter was so plain and so decided that all further discussion was precluded. Let it be observed, that our whole and sole inquiry is: What was the received practice of the Church of S. Cyprian's time? It is manifest that a celebration in the evening, *post cœnam*, was regarded by him as a practice which could not be permitted: that the suggestion of it was sufficiently answered by the argument, 'We have no such custom, neither the Church of God.' *We* celebrate in the morning. And he clenches the whole argument by the command of our Lord, that, *as often* as we celebrate, we shew forth His death, and therefore must use the symbol of His Blood.

neither 'exaggeration' nor ambiguity. He states, not his private opinion, but the practice of the universal Church of Christ. It is as witnessing to that practice that these fathers are of such great value: it is to that practice that Dr. Hessey's theory is opposed. As regards the Councils of Laodicea and Carthage, Dr. Hessey observes, 'As for what is said by the 'Third Council of Carthage, and by the Council of Laodicea, the 'later council, that of Carthage, rules differently from the 'former.' We fear that Dr. Hessey may have been misled by a carelessly expressed passage in the article which appeared in our July number. There is no contradiction between the Council of Laodicea and the Third Council of Carthage. The Council of Carthage gives permission to communicate after supper on one day in the year—Maundy Thursday. The Council of Laodicea forbids any suspension of the usual Lenten fasting on that day. Christians must ξηροφαγεῖν on that day as on others. Such an injunction was in no wise inconsistent with the permission to sup before Communion on that one day.[1]

We are sincerely sorry to observe, in this note, Dr. Hessey's disrespectful attitude towards the authority of the primitive Church. He talks of the 'strong phrases' (p. 484) of its great teachers, treats the language of Chrysostom as unmeaning rhetoric, speaks contemptuously of his 'scruples,' and of Augustine's 'reasoning.' The practice of Bishop Andrewes and Bishop Wilson shows that they felt that the neglect of mixing water with wine, at the Holy Communion, was a point of disloyalty to primitive practice, which was most deeply to be regretted. Dr. Hessey notes the neglect with satisfaction, as detracting from the authority of S. Cyprian. We do not obey the Nicene Canon as to the practice of standing on the Lord's-day. Dr. Hessey welcomes an argument for getting rid of the authority of councils which are less than œcumenical. While on this subject, he appears to regard antiquity as a hostile incubus to be encountered and despatched; and he is naturally at issue with those who seek humbly and thankfully to ascertain and obey its guidance. The 'liberal view' (page 488) to which 'he inclines' is adopted on independent grounds; and he jostles the fathers who intervene, with something less than perfect good humour and fairness, as if he were possessed with an uneasy consciousness that they are, both in the spirit and letter of their writings, against him.

As regards the practical bearings of the question, we remain

[1] Conc. Laod. can. 50. Labbè, i. p. 1505. We must remind Dr. Hessey that although the Council of Laodicea was only provincial, its canons were adopted as part of the code of the universal Church.

unconvinced by Dr. Hessey's arguments or witnesses. On the Sunday the poor man eats his best dinner in the week. It may not be 'abundant' when compared with the tables of the wealthy. But Dr. Hessey treats the case of a person in easy circumstances who communicates after dining late as 'imaginary.' P. 487. Dr. Miller, on the contrary, expressly states that, at S. Martin's, Birmingham, 'the number of evening Communions has gradually increased, and *includes all classes*.' P. 489. Those who communicate early are often weekly communicants. But in S. Martin's, Birmingham, it is the practice to administer Holy Communion on three Sundays in the month, at early, mid-day, and evening hours respectively: so that it would never be possible to communicate on two succeeding Sundays at the same hour (no unimportant matter to religious people), nor on one Sunday at all except at an hour which would be most distressing to a well-instructed Churchman. (See Number of Communicants, 1860.—*Lect.* p. 489.) 'Most people,' says Dr. Miller, 'take an extra rest on Sunday morning.' But Dr. Isaac Watts, if we rightly remember the hymn, did not recommend the habit as religiously healthful, or even tolerable; and in this he would agree with most practical Christians, ancient and modern. Dr. Miller thinks that the 'habits of the population' must decide the question. The people 'soon fall into the plan' of evening Communions. Naturally, when their spiritual guides recommend what falls in with their physical inclinations. Mr. Rowsell is careful to explain his theory of Church order. 'The *souls of my people*,' he exclaims, 'are 'dearer to me than discipline, thankful as I am for discipline, 'when it *leads to*, not *keeps away from*, Christ.' P. 490. Dr. Hessey introduces Mr. Rowsell as the Incumbent of S. Peter's, Stepney, a parish, in 1841, of 7,517 souls, now, probably, of nearly 10,000. If the multitude of Mr. Rowsell's parishioners is to be taken as a justification of his confident claim to do what he likes in the Church, and to dictate laws to it, he stands in this respect at a disadvantage with Mr. Hugh Allen; and whatever authority in doctrine belongs to this gentleman by reason of the populousness of his parish, has now disappeared, by his preferment to a cure of something less than 500 souls. We may remark, however, that, as to the contrast which Mr. Rowsell draws between Church discipline, and 'leading to Christ,' this is the precise argument which is used to justify the Revival sermons at the Victoria Theatre. We are sincerely sorry to be unable to agree with a clergyman of such piety and earnestness of purpose as the Rev. E. Jackson, of S. James', Leeds. Mr. Jackson is too occupied with the care of a large parish to devote much time to the study of

Christian antiquity, else he would not have hazarded the observation that 'the early Christians held their religious assem-'blies in the evenings, or at night, so that with them the 'nocturnal administration of the Lord's Supper was the rule, 'and not the exception'! ! (P. 493.) Nor is it creditable to the University of Oxford that such crude assertions should be put forward, without contradiction, by the Bampton Lecturer. Mr. Jackson's record of his experience is entitled to respect, even where it does not produce conviction. He dwells upon the difficulties of poor mothers with large families. But mothers abroad have children, yet can communicate, and do communicate early. Why not at Leeds? Mr. Jackson speaks of the 'solemnity and depth of devotional feeling' at his evening Communions—and then of the retirement to rest which shrouds these good results from subsequent distraction. Has he sufficiently considered the ascertained phænomenon of *physical excitement*, which enters into all evening worship more or less, and of which some blasphemous and revolting results have lately shown themselves in the London theatres and at Exeter Hall? We do not 'ignore difficulties created by 'poverty, by engagements, by health.' We do not forget the 'kind watchers by the sick,' who cannot get out early, or the other like cares enumerated. We are not heartless archæologists, bent on thrusting our crotchets on practical men for the mere sake of doing so. The principles of ancient Christianity interpret its practice: and from the divergent practice of clergymen like Dr. Miller, we ascend to the implied and unhappy divergence of principle. The question does not lie between fastidious theorists and working clergymen. It is a question between those whose main object is 'to get together most com-'municants' (Lectures, p. 486), and those who desire that all who approach the blessed Sacrament should be sanctified and blest. It is a question between those who imagine the Holy Sacrament to be an acted sermon, calculated to act beneficially

[1] So, again, he terms the evening 'the acknowledged hour in the primitive Church,' p. 494. We observe indeed in the *English Churchman* of December 13th, a line of Prudentius sent by a correspondent, as possibly indicating that the practice of evening Communion was common in the fourth century. The line is:

'Vespertinus edit populus de corpore Christi.'

On referring to the context, however, and to the commentators on the passage, it appears that the whole stands thus (Psychomachia, 374—376):—

'Angelicusne cibus prima in tentoria vestris
Fluxit avis, quem nunc sero felicior ævo
Vespertinus edit populus de corpore Christi:'

and that the epithet 'vespertinus' is applied to the Christian people, as belonging to the 'evening,' the latter ages of the world, in contrast to the children of Israel, fed by manna in the wilderness. We believe there is no question that this is the meaning of the passage.

on the imagination and the heart, and those who beneath the earthly element 'discern,' in its truth and its majestic and awful beauty, 'the Body' of their risen Lord. No class of the population will be benefited by arrangements which imperil the maintenance of sacramental truth, and the true and solid sanctification of human souls. There is such a thing as casting pearls before swine. And the Bishop of Oxford has recently, with his accustomed lucidity and force of expression, condemned evening communions, not merely as at issue with the probable mind of the Apostles, and the current of Christian antiquity, and the Communion-service of the Church of England, but also for this reason, that they are detrimental to the spiritual life. We are as dissatisfied as Dr. Hessey or Mr. Jackson can be with the celebration at 12.30, at the end of a long service, once a month, so common in our town churches. But why, where there are three or four curates in a town parish, cannot there be celebrations at as many hours, say, 7, 8, 9, and 11? This would meet many difficulties: those who could not come at one hour, could come at the next. Dr. Hessey quotes Mr. Skinner, who is 'an invalid,' and 'hurt at being abused for receiving 'Holy Communion after eleven o'clock in the day.' Such cases ought to be always provided for: we do not ignore them. It is only justice to the last-named gentleman, whose opinion would carry weight with many who may read these pages, to say that he has since written to disclaim any sympathy with Dr. Hessey's advocacy of evening Communions. And his letter recorded a piece of clerical irreverence, resulting only too naturally from the abandonment of Catholic authority, and justifying the severe expressions which may have been used by the opponents of the modern innovation.

Mr. Skinner mentions—

'The following order of announcement at a recent Clerical Meeting at Hereford:—

Dinner	3 o'clock.
Clerical Prayer-meeting	5.30.
Sermon	7.

To be followed by Holy Communion.
Dinner each day at the Green Dragon. Tickets, 3*s.* 6*d.* each.'

'These after-dinner[1] communicants,' adds Mr. Skinner, 'were

[1] Dr. Hessey is surprised at 'the invention of a new epithet, "*post-prandial*," to stigmatize a late reception.' But the appearance of new facts, or practices, evokes and necessitates a new phraseology.

> —— si fortè necessè est
> Indiciis monstrare recentibus abdita rerum,
> Fingere cinctutis non exaudita Cethegis
> Continget.—

'under no pressure from the difficulties of which you speak. 'They were Priests of the Church of England.'—*Letter to Dr. Hessey, Guardian, November 28th,* 1860.

If we have been frank in speaking of the one great demerit of Dr. Hessey's work, this does not prevent the acknowledgment that he has on the whole done by his book good service to the English Church, and to the cause of that Blessed Day, the joyous and devout observance of which is so integral an element of the life and well-being of her members. France and Germany, as represented by their more religious minds, envy us a blessing, which we may not surrender to agitators at home, because it is occasionally defended upon uncatholic or uncritical grounds. Dr. Hessey has shown that Sunday may be maintained by arguments which touch the conscience, without violating the instincts of thoughtful Christians. We wish his book a second edition, and hope that it may be expurgated of what, in our opinion, it can very well spare.

'Post-prandial' expresses a literal fact respecting evening communions. We are glad that Dr. Hessey sees in the mere record of that fact a 'stigma.' Those who originate or assist novelties must expect them to be named, not necessarily with any evil purpose, but to prevent confusion and to promote clearness of thought and intercourse.

ART. V.—1. *My Life, and What shall I do with It?* By AN OLD MAID. London: Longman.

2. *Ploughing and Sowing.* By A CLERGYMAN'S DAUGHTER. Edited by REV. F. DIGBY LEGARD. London: J. & C. Mozley.

3. *The Missing Link.* By L. N. R. London: Nisbet.

4. *Sunshine in the Workhouse.* By MRS. G. W. SHEPPARD. London: Nisbet.

AMIDST much that is discouraging and even alarming in our social condition and prospects, it must be considered a favourable sign that evils are not ignored. The nation is not allowed to shut its eyes to the miseries of its lowest classes. The want, the ignorance, the crime that prevail wherever masses of men congregate, are set before us, again and again, with a terrible distinctness. Forcible pens picture scenes of pain and guilt; eloquent lips call upon us to do something to remedy them. Nor do they speak in vain. From various and opposite quarters, we hear the question asked, 'What can we do, how can we help, and, especially, how can we use our time in the service of the lost and miserable?' Each questioner speaks for a class. The energy that demands work upbraids others in like circumstances for standing idle, assuming that it only needs a sphere of action, for each to find himself armed and equipped for the conflict. The unoccupied are not left to their leisure, they are not allowed to plead inexperience or incapacity, they are shamed into difficult enterprises. It is assumed that the emergency will make the missionary. There are the poor, the erring, the miserable; confront want, and crime, and despair, in person; meet them face to face, the power will be given you to relieve, instruct, console. In the words of one now organizing a great scheme of centralized, all-pervading benevolence, and calling the West-end to his aid: 'Every unoccupied person can give us his time, and we will make it precious.'

Language so sanguine found in the columns of the *Times*, and supported by an article, pressing on its readers the importance of seeing the misery we relieve, must awake sympathy, and, we may hope, will issue in real good: especially as we find 'W. D. B.,' [Mr. Davenport Bromley] as time goes on, content with his instruments, as though he had lighted on a wholly new vein of charity, boasting that 'as much of our work is done hitherto by idle men, so we 'have drawn and shall draw our 'funds from sources which never flowed before.' But our readers are of a class too well versed by experience in the diffi-

culties attendant on this duty, and in the thought and preparation that are necessary for any effectual service to the poor, to accept this language implicitly; it needs more than a zealous committee of high aims to make the time of the unoccupied 'and idle' man precious; he can only do this for himself. Men are generally unoccupied because on the whole they like having nothing to do, or nothing of a very exacting and onerous character; an unoccupied man is the last person in the world to adapt himself to a system. Spasmodic efforts, a burst or effusion of benevolence, are more in his way, where misery may be relieved by a kind word and a liberal gift. But a great deal of this form of charity would not be for the good of society. Nor is it the kind aimed at by Mr. Bromley, though it would certainly be the form most in vogue if fine gentlemen and ladies set out in their carriages in search of distress. The most conspicuous destitution is alone what touches the sensibilities of persons not trained by observation and knowledge to see below the surface, and though this naked poverty is often only too genuine in our great cities, it is also the form that needs the most practised judgment to meet it; for it is the aspect of want that belongs to utter improvidence, misconduct, or direct imposture. These are the cases where, after all, it is best to trust your alms to experience, if experience is to be got at. A few cases of failure falling upon a newly awakened zeal have often a fatal effect. The rich man not familiar with such scenes, who has been three or four times taken in by cases of obtrusive distress, under the immediate sight of which he had been ready to charge every responsible person with neglect and cruelty, is apt, after the excitement is over and his narrow experience gained, to talk of the poor as if he had found them out, and knew them to be a class there was no helping, and who were endowed with a peculiar race of vices with which he and his own rank had no participation.

The way to know and help the poor is not to approach them first where the distance is widest between their need and our superfluities, where this contrast presses itself to the exclusion of fellow feelings; but, for rich and poor to meet together, and know each other, there must be the opportunities for sympathy which intercourse of mind brings; and this needs time. It is a slow process, and implies certain habits of thought hardly to be acquired amid violent contrasts, sudden perturbations of feeling on one side, and the pressure of immediate want on the other. It has been said, not of the idle but the over busy, that a lawyer or merchant seeking out the starving mechanic with no previous experience to guide him, would, before the interview had lasted three minutes, blow his nose, talk of the weather, give another

half-crown, and retreat thinking the poor, bores; and thus increase the distance between them by making the man he had relieved more alive to that distance than before. The picture certainly has an air of probability, yet we should by no means despair even of the lawyer if he had any opportunity of trying again, under more natural circumstances—in the country for example—where he might find leisure to approach the question and learn something of the poor as a class, using his reason and his habits of research; but these, or something like these, are the conditions of useful service, and in the meanwhile, with a mind unprepared and preoccupied, his half-crown will probably do more good and go farther, dispensed by one who has some chance of knowing to whom he gives it. That the poor should be over visited by fashionable ladies and gentlemen is hardly such a danger that we need have touched on it, except as bearing on the important question, now so often stirred, how the miseries of our lowest classes shall be best met, relieved, and, if possible, in some degree checked altogether; objects requiring tenderness, firmness, and that tact and perception which only real thought and study, joined with practice, can give. It is impossible wholly to escape imposition, and imposture drowns the cry of real want by its impudent and clamorous importunity; but the inexperienced making trial on the confused masses of a London poor quarter, are likely to be its first victims. If they have the gift of perseverance they will take these as a sort of necessary fee of entrance to a new occupation, and profit by the warning. Many feeling themselves duped will retire in disgust. The strength of the class who are to succour and civilize the poor of London, must be drawn from such as have made the work a subject of previous thought, even though circumstances may have stood in the way of active participation in the work.

One merit we cannot but note in Mr. Bromley's scheme, that it calls upon men, and those laymen, to take their share in works of active charity. Men, as men, always excepting the clergy and their agents, are generally supposed to be too busy or self-important for active benevolence, except what can be transacted in public meetings and committees. He reckons on new life and vigour from the hitherto unproductive class of unoccupied men; but that all men, as such, should not only help the poor but come in contact with them, is set forth as a duty. This is an exception to the general order at present, which assigns the work to women, on the ground generally that they have nothing else to do—on the ground, too, that both in numbers and zeal they have shown themselves most ready and forward in the good work of service which human misery and degradation have marked out for them. One reason for this universal agreement

lies in the fact that all the books written on the subject, all the calls on popular attention, seem to be from the pens of women. All the interest that has been excited is through their means; if we would except the present movement of the newspaper press itself, assisted, as is reported, by a noble female pen. If then we would approach the subject at all, it must be as tinctured by the question so inextricably wrapped up with it in our own day, how the energies of women may be brought to bear on it, and how they may best become—according to the technical phrase in vogue—workers.

But on this point it is not to be denied that a certain collision takes place between the speculative philanthropy of the two sexes. Men are very glad for women to assist, but women on their side, if they are to work, demand a new and firmer basis for their exertions; these are no longer to be desultory, accidental, called out by some sudden emergency, as they have been, and so finding them unprepared by method and discipline for the work, but reduced to system. Hence the difference of view, and hence the current agitation on the uselessness of women's lives. It is woman who discovers that women are unoccupied. The cry for employment, more work, and that of a more responsible kind, arises from eloquent female pens. This involves a claim of independence which the world is slow to recognise, and very naturally so, for all proposals for a separation of interests, and dissolution of the old partnership which man has always headed, is a blow to the imperial idea of supremacy. It is clear, at any rate, that the leading female philanthropy of the age suspects this, and is in arms at every masculine demur. The old conservative fear hitherto so futile, that educating the working classes should make them discontented with a subordinate place, may shift its ground, for women, it is said, are educated above the work assigned to them; they are endowed with a fair share of man's knowledge, and left with nothing to do except to minister to man's needs and comforts, which, as matters now stand in the existing anomalous state of things, half of them could do as well or better than the whole. To accommodate themselves to this posture of affairs, they demand not only room for individual action, which has never been denied, and, indeed, constantly accorded with acclamation, but a new system. They require that men should alter their views of the natural position of women, that society should go through some fundamental changes to enable women to devote themselves with more concentration of purpose to the great cause of ameliorating the condition of the poor and ignorant of their own sex, or for their own private advantage. Nothing short of this is really the aim of the work at the head of our list, though characterised by a

remarkable moderation of tone, as well as by much independent thought and practical good sense. It has, indeed, been especially designated as *sensible*, as an example to, and exception from, ordinary female writers, by a journal (*The Saturday Review*) which does not often devote its columns to the praise of woman's sense and judgment, nor to advocating for her a wider and more independent sphere of action. There is so much to be done, and women have such peculiar facilities for certain spheres of usefulness, that we are ready to welcome any suggestions for the development and application of their powers, which do not interfere with what we have been accustomed to regard as first principles; but is there not something revolutionary in the unflinching assertion that so soon as a woman is grown up, the disposition of her time and the choice of her home cease to be subjects for parental authority? The statement stands as peroration to the chapter on female education. The authoress has been speaking of the aspirations after usefulness which take form on reaching womanhood, whenever that state is attained:—

'Very possibly she may crave this woman's work almost on her first release from school duties; the many present discussions on the subject are likely to make her do so. It is never wise to interfere with these differences of character; perhaps it would be better if she were not grown up so soon; but if she is, it is better to be guided by the fact that is, than the theory that should be.

'But when a woman is once grown up, her parents' work as educators cease: wise and dearest friends they may be, invaluable and most reverenced, counsellors and guides; but educators and rulers they cease to be, by the appointment of God and by the laws of man. Henceforth she must be responsible for her own actions; God's will is her law, His Spirit her appointed Educator and Guide; she finds herself placed in such circumstances as God has appointed for her, and in submission to this expression of His will, it is her business so to use them as may be most for the service of His church on earth. To parents, therefore, we cease to speak.'—*My Life, and What shall I do with It?* p. 52.

It is very possible that the place the *Christian Remembrancer* occupies in this lady's pages as a foe to progress, and a type and representative of man's selfishness, may have led us to seek the grounds of difference between ourselves and one whose designs for usefulness, and ordinary tone meet our sympathy and approbation; but that certain remarks in our pages (see art. on 'Female Occupation and Influence,' *Christian Remembrancer*, April, 1858) should have caused such marked and yet contradictory dissent drives us to the conclusion that the extreme parts of her book embody hopes for the future of her sex, with which we cannot sympathize. Leaving our contemporaries, the *Edinburgh* and *Saturday Reviews*, to defend themselves against the charge of holding low and secular views of woman's place in the universe, we, who are taken to embody the sentiments of the

domestic man, must declare ourselves not ashamed to have assumed the father's house to be the home for his daughters, which, strictly speaking, is the gist of our offence—*one* offence we mean. In excusing some women for expending some—*only* some—of their manual energies on a scarcely remunerative class of toil—needlework, or any other light easily laid down employment—we ventured to express an opinion, that somebody in every house must be open to interruption, and in such an attitude of readiness for any new call as absorption in a severe pursuit does not imply. If this is not so, then family life, as we all of us know it and value it, is a mistake and a forbidden pleasure. But our simple plea elicits satirical comments on how little the domestic man knows or realizes the state of his grown-up family; and a further argument to prove that *one* daughter could in every house do the work, now divided among three or four, and still be ready at the father's call to mend his gloves and write his notes. We might complain on our side that we are misunderstood, if we are supposed to have asserted that a man only values the ladies of his household for their services. May not the father have some likings, and longings for his daughters' society beyond mere mechanical assistances? Even if one daughter could do all the work he wanted, he might yet cling to the society of two, and not wish to be rid of even four, if Providence had given them to him, and had not as yet called them away by any unmistakeable voice. Nature and custom agree to send his boys from him—often after ten years old, almost always before they are twenty; home is called home by them, more in virtue of affection than length of residence. But nature and custom make no such demand on the daughters of the house, nor do we believe that men can ever be brought to see an analogy between the two cases. It could not come into a man's mind to regard his younger daughters as set apart and dedicated to missionary work, because they are 'superfluous.' The experiment has yet to be tried of young women leaving home for a perfectly independent existence, subject only to their own ideas of right and duty: even though that existence is to be spent in the service of others, in works of mercy. All societies have felt the need of restraints, checks, and stringent authority, and even vows, to replace the sacred discipline of home.

'My Life, and What shall I do with It?' is addressed to young gentlewomen; they are the class who are to be influenced by the writer's arguments. We cannot think it sensible or wise to press on them the consideration that in a very little time, indeed while they read, they are in a condition to decide for themselves, whether there is a work for them to do in their father's house, or whether 'it is not rather their duty to go

'where the work is and do it there,' and this on the bidding of Bishop Butler, of all people in the world.

'That helping these is as much our natural and proper work as adding sunshine to our own homes, is directly asserted by Bishop Butler. Indeed, he does not hesitate to say, that to add pleasure to the lives of the comparatively prosperous and happy with whom we live, is not even the principal use we ought to make of the power God has given us to help others. And no one can suspect him of a sentimental preference of out-of-the-way duties to near ones. He says, "pain and sorrow and misery, as such, *have a right* to our assistance."' —*Ibid.* p. 55.

In like manner to young girls we think the following strain injudicious; our poor selves are still the objects of satire; we are the advocates of needlework to keep superfluous young ladies, that is, superfluous daughters, content at home.

'In teaching sewing you will not find very much advantage from skill in the foppery of needlework, which just now it is the fashion with many to laud so much, especially with gentlemen who are benevolently anxious to find some occupation for superfluous young ladies, that may make them content to live at home, doing little good and less harm, until they are brought out of the household cupboard to be married, or as aunts to save somebody else the trouble of minding their own children, or the annoyance of paying for their being cared for.'—*Ibid.* pp. 331-2.

Now the care of nephews and nieces thus summarily treated as the mere demand of selfishness is really a very excellent practice and discipline for young people in the duties of life, and the more excellent because natural. We perceive that this lady and ourselves should differ very much as to whether a given home did supply work or not. It may seem to a young and ardent spirit a far grander, nobler, more self-denying thing to quit her father's house and labour in some London scene of want and wretchedness; but, when the age of thirty comes, we sincerely believe that upon most characters the exercise of patience and self-discipline in a home where there are children to care for and train, and many and various calls for help and assistance to be cheerfully complied with, will have been more beneficial than a youth spent on the rule of seeking out where the misery is greatest and the want most urgent. Nor can we believe that there are so many homes where practical work in the service of the poor is impossible; there may be difficulties to be overcome needing a resolute determination and clear judgment, but effectual service any where needs a good share of these.

The authoress thus pleads with the daughters of a household, assuming, we presume, that it lies in a scene where external work does not offer itself:—

'For consider with each other, when all you can do for the comfort and happiness of your own family is sufficiently attended to, how much time have you left in the day, in the week. If one sister at home were to undertake all

that two or three or four now divide among them, would it be more than were wise for her to attempt? One unmarried daughter in moderate health is generally competent for all these: then if the others *were* wanted elsewhere, they might be away from home by turns for the greater part of the year, assembling again for the usual family gatherings, without one family duty being neglected. In fact this is a thing continually done, and no one has a word to say against it, if the absent daughter is giving pleasure and comfort to the comparatively prosperous and fortunate; it is only when she has gone to help the friendless and indigent that any outcry about home ties is made. And yet I am persuaded that the home duties would be better fulfilled,—with more cheerfulness and spirit, with a more watchful care,—in such a family, than when all stay at home on the supposition they are all attending to them: half or quarter work is never so well done, in the long run, as full work. Nor would the happiness of such a home be diminished to mothers, fathers, or brothers: to be patient and good-tempered, and to keep our private troubles from troubling others, is our duty, and is practicable under much greater depression than we are called to endure; but to be in really good spirits from twenty to fifty, without any interesting employment, is simply impossible.'—*Ibid.* pp. 57-8.

We cannot but think it a great risk to press upon girls of twenty the dulness of home, to fill their minds with these gloomy prospects concerning the place to which custom at any rate confines them, and where Providence *seems* surely to have cast their lot. But it is not on this ground alone or chiefly that we doubt the wisdom of this lady's scheme. She thinks that she sufficiently bears in mind, what in theory she never wishes to forget—woman's subordinate place in the human economy—by confining all her plans to the amelioration of women, poor, ignorant, and neglected by their more blessed and fortunate sisters; but, in reality, the mighty evils of a vast neglected class cannot be met by women separating themselves from men and acting independently. What a picture does this raise of a father and brothers staying at home and making their fortunes quite away from that sphere of benevolence pointed out by Bishop Butler, and the daughters going forth to encounter it single-handed. If, in the progress of refinement, or the caprices of fashion and luxury, *men* have removed themselves and their families from the neighbourhood and sight of the classes who labour in their service, and by whom their wealth is won; it is not the right remedy for his daughters to return to the city, the court, and the alley, alone: society altogether must be roused, must work in concert; not the most impressible, the most tender, the most subject to impulse, be put forward as pioneers or solitary workers. We describe them thus because, though the authoress does not advise girls to begin the work, she does to prepare themselves for it by intention, by deliberate facing of their prospects, and a course of study; and the idea, in carrying out the scheme, is to establish in the scene of labour a home of some kind without the ties of a sister-

hood or the restraint of a superior invested with authority. It often seems as if such a home might be a refuge indeed to single women whose natural ties are broken, and who would gladly spend their time in the service of others. We will collect a few passages that embody the writer's suggestions:—

'Ladies, of all ages above twenty-five, and of different fortunes, cannot go to solitary lodgings in St. Giles's, nor round the hospitals or dispensaries, or workhouses; nor could they do much good by so setting to work single-handed. Whatever a large religious party may have to say of the evils of sisterhoods, and however keen to detect that dangerous thing wherever ladies live together for any higher object than their own personal convenience; common sense tells us that the protection that is needful for unmarried women under a certain age, going into society of their own rank, is quite as needful, though it may be in a different form, on entering into such works as these.

* * * * * *

'Whether called a college, or a home, or a hospital, or nothing at all; there must be, for the real execution of this work, a house where gentlewomen can live together, and arrange their work with each other, and with those who are to work with them or over them: that they may have mutual protection and counsel; live at less expense, and without the harass and anxiety of house-keeping, of balancing wayward accounts, and vexing their spirits, how by cutting off this and that expense they may raise a little surplus for the boundless wants they meet with; when it is hard perhaps already to make both ends balance, or when their strength to work depends on the comfort there is to be cut off; where they may escape the loneliness and cheerlessness of solitary lodgings, and secure a wise division of labour. And to be effectual, these homes however private, must be in some sort institutions whose existence is recognised, whose objects are known, and whose management is in a measure guaranteed by the names of those who have the direction of them.'—*Ibid.* pp. 140-1.

There follows a list of the particular works to be pursued in such a home, obvious to those conversant in such plans:—

"Great question has been raised as to the rules and government of such a home, great doubts as to whether we can live together in peace and obedience; as to the connexion of the society with the Church, and its ministers, and as to the religious rules to be observed. Ladies forced together by any non-natural principles or exaggerated feeling, and having little to do, will never be likely to live in peace. No set of people would. But voluntarily living in the same house because engaged in similar pursuits, and each having plenty of her own work to do—this is a very different thing; peace is the *natural* consequence of having nothing to quarrel about, and having enough to do is the real remedy for that meddling spirit which cannot help judging another's servant: the mutual need of each other's help and sympathy would make peace almost a necessity. But the necessity for obedience to one head arises from an entirely different purpose and aim than the one advocated now; and whatever other objects it would effect, it would defeat those we have been speaking of. I fear women can never rule their equals justly or wisely; but if they could, what we need for the accomplishment of this work, are the best efforts of individual minds and hearts; and to get this, or anything like it, we must provide the freest possible scope for individual powers.

* * * * * *

'It will be a great blessing if all in such a home can join in the same religious worship, as will generally be the case: but if they cannot, it will be

still a blessing that they can all unite in that labour which is also worship. Compliance with necessary household arrangements is no more than all unmarried gentlewomen are accustomed to yield. Nor can I imagine why we should interfere with each other's taste in dress: each of us can set a *silent* example of good taste to the rest: but ordinary persons, going quietly about their ordinary business, need no uniform to mark them out as different from the rest of their class.'—*Ibid.* pp. 152-5.

Experience has hitherto shown that societies must rather tighten than relax rules of uniformity; a sisterhood of different denominations is surely a Utopian scheme, though we do not wonder that a lady whose thoughts are concentrated on the one great evil and a scheme for its remedy, should treat most difficulties and objections as fastidious and unimportant. In the same spirit we find her, in discussing Sunday-school teaching, warning against dogmatism, apart from the question of whether the dogma is true; attributing, indeed, much of the infidelity of our mechanics to the positive dogmatism of Sunday-school teaching, as though it were reasonable to expect persons engaged in so irksome a work to suppress their own opinions and conclusions. Of course this is the natural tendency (and has its useful side) in all engaged in some large comprehensive scheme. The heart that swells at the prevalence of unrestrained vice, frets at what are called party distinctions; but this perhaps implies that feelings stirred, and a temper rendered exacting by the emergency, do not constitute the state of mind for organising large schemes and new combinations for united action. The authoress shows a considerable practical knowledge in the details of visiting and teaching. We have glimpses of large personal experiences of the different classes she treats of, and her advice on these details will be of service to many who would have little sympathy with the theories to which we have directed our readers' attention.

We are most favourably struck both by her judgment and right feeling, when treating of the character and temper of the poor in connexion with certain wholesale statements and popular fallacies in regard to them. Take, for instance, the following answer to the charge of ingratitude:—

'I believe it will be found that those charities or modes of giving relief which do harm to the recipient, which produce ingratitude, envy, deception, and pauperism, all err more or less in these respects:—Either they are administered in a mechanical way, not by friend to friend, but by boards or ticket agents; or they are quite inappropriate, and do not supply the real want; or they are totally insufficient. If you take, for example, the case of our hospitals, which have never been charged with a demoralizing effect, you will see that they are free from all these defects, or at least they only fail when they fall into the last of them: for, first, no one is admitted into them who does not need the help they give; the relief given is just what they want, and is as complete on the whole as our present skill can make it.'—*Ibid.* p. 243.

And there is food for thought in the following strictures on ordinary religious talk, though perhaps the warning is somewhat strongly put:—

'Any one who undertakes regular visiting amongst the poor, should make it a solemn rule to herself, never to utter one word *of her own* on a religious subject, the truth of which she has not realized herself: there is perhaps no work which requires more present faith in the promised aid of the Holy Spirit to teach us what we ought to say, and to make us say what is needed, though we may not yet understand it, than this of visiting for the purpose of religious conversation. What we repeat by rote, is almost sure to be either false, or falsely stated; what we have ourselves found to be real, however imperfectly and partially we know it, is so far as it goes true. And if, as continually happens, they need something more than we have yet learned for ourselves, the plain words of Scripture, especially of the Psalms, will be understood by them in that fuller sense which experience in sorrow gives, though we who repeat them cannot enter into it. It is, however, a very difficult matter.'—*Ibid.* pp. 226-7.

Different chapters are devoted to the subjects of school-teaching, night-schools, Sunday-schools, classes of young shop-women, to whom she shows (and we know it has been proved) that ladies can be of great service by infusing a higher tone of feeling, and a more rational basis of self-respect—Bible classes, visiting the poor, nursing—forming altogether a catalogue of good works, for which women are fitting, if not, as in many they are, the very best agents. In all these, if in some points of detail we differ, we recognise a person whose experience, and manner of using her experience, give her a right to enforce her opinions.

One half of the book, however, is devoted to the preparation necessary for fitting one class of women to be teachers and benefactors of the other and larger class which need their aid. Here we find ourselves sometimes at odds with our authoress; but there is always satisfaction in the real opinions of sincere earnest people; something good and useful may always be drawn from the conclusions of a reason guided by its own proper observation; they are a quota to the general stock of thought; though it must always be borne in mind that experience in one field is no security for a right judgment out of that field, and this lady's experience teaching her the wants of the poor and how to work amongst them, does not necessarily guide her to a knowledge of how the want is to be supplied, or to clear views of the position, nature, and duties of her own sex. Indeed, there is a constant clashing and confusion between her original views of society and its claims, and the necessities of want and ignorance. It results in a compromise, in leaving a certain portion of her sex—all who are 'wanted'—as they are, and endeavouring to withdraw all who are not wanted, to labour in her field. A very

plausible notion, only it practically calls upon girls to decide whether they are wanted or not by the time they are twenty, and to begin then to fit themselves by an exceptional discipline; and upon fathers to acquiesce in whatever decision is arrived at. And here, we think, the domestic man, slighted as knowing so little what are the feelings of his daughters, may turn tables on the authoress, and demonstrate how little she knows of the peculiarities of fathers. Fathers will give their daughters in marriage, they will send them out into the world, if needs be, to get their own living, they will settle them for life in nunneries—but as for giving them a yearly allowance, and sending them independent and untied into the world to do good, as they send their sons to learn trades and professions, the world will never be mended at all, if this is to be the only way of mending it. It should, however, be explained, that the plan is not for an abandonment of home, even for those who make benevolence their profession. She stipulates for occasional return to society, which would answer to the son's vacations, explaining very sensibly—

'When the plan has already been tried (I mean of gentlewomen going to reside together where their work lay), they have generally gone for a portion of the year only. In the refuge at Bussage, among those of the teachers of the working women's classes who do not reside in London, and I believe in King's College Hospital, this is the case. Some arrangement of this kind would be absolutely necessary for most. In spite of all that has been said of the desolate estate of single gentlewomen, I am convinced a very small portion indeed are absolutely without home or family ties, which must not be broken. And it would be most advisable, for the health of all, and for the efficiency of their work, that there should be at least a considerable break in it: to be continually teaching, we must be continually learning: however, to do both at once is more than most of us have strength for. It cannot be too often insisted on, that bodily health, good spirits, and that freshness of mind and feeling, which occasional enjoyment of intelligent and pleasant society, general reading, and change of scene are the easiest means of giving, are indispensable in carrying on this kind of work. This is the great evil of nunneries, that their inmates get perforce into one narrow groove, and dwindle away in it all through their lives.' —*Ibid.* pp. 156-7.

But in her sanguine moods she pictures a great social change, and amuses herself with a picture of what may be:—

'And if in future times, though we scarcely expect such serious results, the givers of parties shall have to take as much pain to secure a proper proportion of dancing and singing young ladies, as now to enlist a sufficient supply of gentlemen: if at balls, young Guardsmen, instead of considering through their eye-glasses which of a dozen pretty girls is most worthy of being solicited to dance with them, shall have to be early in their application, and agreeable in their conversation, in order to be secure of having any partners at all; if at dinner parties undergraduates and young barristers have to follow *en masse*, instead of being followed by the youngest daughter with her cousins from the rectory; yet it is not to be doubted they will survive the change, may indeed be compensated for it by its beneficial effects on their own demeanour.'—*Ibid.* p. 62.

The want of weight and practical bearing in all this, in spite of much good sense in detail, lies in the antagonism which female speculative writers are so apt to assume between the sexes. They work themselves into a sort of partisanship. Each sex has its individualities, its distinct tones of thought, and feeling, but men and women do know a great deal of one another, and the system which is not built on this knowledge, which assumes antipathies rather than sympathies, can make no way. The first discussion between sensible men and women, the first lively wrangle between boys and girls, will, on different grounds, blow it all to the winds: the first by sound rational discourse, the second because the young ladies will come to the conclusion that they may not prove superfluities, that they may be wanted after all.

Our authoress's scheme of self-education has the merit of being her own. She acquiesces in the pressure laid upon girls in the school-room as a fact which does not concern her; when they have passed through this phase, she pleads for a period of thorough relaxation; travelling, lively society, dancing, singing, and even what is understood by a London season, where this can be obtained. She is not insensible to the risks of such a course, but, on the whole, she deems it necessary to run some risks to secure bright cheerful health, and animal spirits. But she reckons on all young ladies worth anything to her, soon tiring of this course, running through it, and coming out feeling a want—a necessity of working for others—and this need she meets by suggestions both of a field and of a line of preparation for it, consisting mainly of a course of correctives for what she considers essentially female faults, on which she thus severely reflects:—

'Another cause of the confusion of mind and fragmentary knowledge so common amongst us is the want of attention. Of all habits cultivated amongst educated women, the habit of inattention in respect of what they read, learn, and hear, is, I believe, the most constantly practised, and the most invincible; they listen, they can repeat, but they never apply their minds to the real consideration of the subject for more than a minute or two at a time. People talk of the increase of mental activity, when the real state they speak of is rather an increase of mental passivity: knowledge and notions run hither and thither through our heads in such rapid trains, that the mind has little to do with it, except as the patient silent tramroad that receives all, keeps nothing.' *Ibid.* p. 275.

Perhaps this is not so exclusively feminine a line of mental action, but it no doubt hits a blot. The authoress's remedy is a severe course of study of a very few books—Bishop Butler's 'Sermons and Analogys,' Abercombie's 'Intellectual Powers and Moral Sentiments,' Bishop Whately's 'Logic,' and Hooker's 'Ecclesiastical Polity' if within hearing of the contro-

versies of the day; which are all to be read and re-read with notes and abstracts, and the fullest severity of getting up. To form the mind, to acquire habits of thought, to be able to fix the attention, and hold the reason under control, are the motives for this discipline, which demands no little sacrifice:—

'You will read much less on this plan, and will therefore find yourself falling behind your companions in general information, especially about books. A girl who spends three years in getting up the works named above, cannot be *au fait* in the fashionable philosophy of the season. Neither will the greater correctness of what she does know be much help—rather, perhaps, an hindrance,—to her success in general conversation. Still I think you will find, after a while, that you have read much more to your own benefit, and that though you may not be aided in talking, you will have much more pleasure in listening. It is quite unnecessary,—though *if* you enjoy it, it will be a very agreeable amusement,—to know a good deal of history, of travels, of biographies, or to skim all the sciences. But if you aim at being a teacher, and still more a guide and educator, you must before all things know thoroughly the little you need to know, and be able to express correctly and easily what you have to teach. You must know it so that when you are thrown out of the beaten track, you shall still be mistress of it, able to recognise it from your new standing-point, and able to use it in its new application; and you cannot do this unless you have learnt to fix your attention, control your thoughts, make them "clear to yourself," and express them correctly and intelligibly to others. The reading that is taken up as a real relaxation is a very different matter, though not less needful nor useful in its place.'—*Ibid.* pp. 287-8.

All depends upon whether this sort of study is really congenial. To some we quite believe it is. There is a great capacity for hard mental work, for patiently following the leading of some mind they can implicitly submit to, in some women. In this course they can labour, without any immediate end in view, more docilely than men; yet we could say something on the risk of checking certain feminine excellencies of mind and temperament by too rigid a strain, if we could seriously contemplate any probability of this advice being largely followed. But to the majority of young ladies, zealous to begin some noble career of self-sacrifice, the three years' discipline would oppose rather a chill, though perhaps salutary barrier; and we admit that it tempers the apparent imprudence of telling young women they are their own mistresses, if, at the same time, they can be made to accept this as the necessary tax of independence. But the work must be congenial, it must not be mere plodding, if it is to strengthen the mind and to bear any useful fruit. Lighter studies, if indeed history is such a very light study, tell better, we suspect, on average minds, nor do we like to throw even the faintest slight on the well-informed woman, whose retentive memory serves her in such good stead, and who is such a bright and valued member of every intelligent circle. However, the authoress does not impose a burden she has not herself borne. She recommends what she has practised, though her style has

not always the accuracy and clearness she assumes to be the sure reward of such labours. Her merits and defects are still feminine. There is the tendency she deplores in her sex of running away with half impressions, and now and then the practice which has been attributed to ladies of clearing up the intricacies of a long sentence by interspersing it with full stops. There are the truth and knowledge of detail, the observation, the right feeling, tact, and sympathy, the judgment and good sense wherever personal experience has been the guide which distinguish the sensible woman, and the absence of power to take a large view and embrace all sides of a question which so constantly go along with these. That she has thought for herself, and kept clear of conventional ideas and language, such passages as the following prove. It contains not only useful counsel, but some thoughts deserving to be called original:—

'Young children of every class are alike: but in dealing with those who are grown up, though their common nature is the same, and their thoughts and feelings in the main much the same as ours; yet the forms these take, and the way in which they are expressed or concealed, are so very different, you will scarcely recognise any identity at first. Story books about the poor, and even lives of the poor, will for the most part only mislead you: the latter have been written of those who were remarkable, *i.e.* unlike the generality, or have recorded only what was considered edifying in them: the former for the most part represent the poor as so much easier to understand, so much more simple and less natural than they are; as so easily guided and so very easily converted; just making sufficient opposition to allow of the story winding up with the proper victory of good over evil. Now I think you will find it very much the contrary; that the less cultivated a man is, the less susceptible he will be to the power of new truth, the less lasting impression will be made on him by it, and the more open he will be to error and mere impulse: that the less educated he is, the more enslaved he will be to the power of habit, and the harder it will be for him to acquire any new habit. Probably there may be more real difference in force of character, power of mind, and capacity for feeling, than there is amongst the generality of those whom a tolerably equal education has formed in the same mould, but their characters are less developed, and therefore seem at least to be less marked; and it is often far less easy to get at their mind, because the power of thinking clearly and expressing themselves truly (which are the main objects of education), are possessed by them in a very inferior degree even to what is common amongst ourselves. I have observed this difference very strongly marked in the comparative absence of expression in their countenances: and this may show us what sort of value to put upon characters drawn from physiognomical observations: in an educated person who is free from the necessity of hard manual labour, want of expression in the countenance may be a proof of absence of anything to express; but it is not so in these. However strongly they may feel, you will not find much varied expression in those mouths that seem at the first glance all exactly alike, nor in those eyes and weather-stained features, that have been "set against the sun and sky" the most part of their lives.

'The moral of all this is, we must be very slow in forming, and not very anxious to form, any fixed opinion about the characters of the people we labour amongst. The more ignorance, dulness, or vulgarity meets us, the slower must we be in giving up the hope of doing good; for these are signs of the want of

cultivation, and not by any means proofs that there is nothing capable, and, it may be, well worthy of cultivation: whilst they show that the power of expressing what good may be there is lost, and that you must draw it out. Take for granted in every new acquaintance you make that you are ignorant of his character, and regard each discovery of it that comes before you as only a partial one; as a hint by which you may judge of part, but not of all that is going on there; and be content to be ignorant, keeping your object straight before you, and remembering, that you are not engaged in studying a character for the purpose of philosophizing, nor a spirit for the sake of indulging your own kind curiosity as to its religious state: but that you are trying to get acquainted with a fellow-being, that you may be the better able to be his friend and helper. Persons question the sick and dying, as if the only thing of importance to them was that the visitor should think they are saved—a knowledge which, as far as regards the sick person, is the merest impertinence in the world; for what possible difference can it make to me that Mr. Ryle thinks me safe, or not safe, or indeed thinks nothing at all about it? whilst, so far as it affects the visitor, it can only lead him into temptation.'—*Ibid.* pp. 318-21.

On this same subject of expression there is also a very nice and yet just distinction drawn between a knowledge of character and a quick perception of states of feeling. In order to know a character, we must be at least its equal, in some sort above it; but to follow states of feeling implies rather sympathy, tact, and observation centered on the present moment. She warns women against what she considers a fashionable amusement of the present day, the dissection and discussion of other people's characters, which she regards as a very profitless pursuit, while she urges them to the less ambitious study of present tempers and feelings as more serviceable to the objects of it:—

'Now you will observe that what we practically need in this woman's work, is not the power of judging character, but power to perceive and enter into the actual mood and feeling, and presence of mind to meet it: no doubt persons may possess this power in very different degrees, but I am persuaded that the difference depends much more on cultivation by practice, than on natural gifts. At any rate it may be attained to a very great extent, by an habitual loving attention to what passes before us in those with whom we live, as shown by face and voice and gesture. So far as I have had the opportunity of observing, those persons who are accounted to have a special gift for the discernment of character, have been persons of keen sight, who have formed the habit of closely watching the passing expressions of people's faces: and those, on the other hand, who have been renowned for blundering out the wrong things to the wrong person, at the wrong time, have either been exceedingly deficient in the general habit of observation, or persons who are altogether occupied with their own feelings, or else very short-sighted.'—*Ibid.* p. 314.

There are some good remarks, in which we entirely concur, on the present movement for employing women on what has hitherto been exclusively man's work. The poor cannot eventually be benefited by a general reduction of wages, which must follow where a large additional supply of labour is brought into the market, for which there is no increased demand. Besides that the labour of women must always undersell that of men, because

they can both live upon less, and are more easily 'put upon,' to use a popular phrase. In acknowledgment and reply to this, it has been said, in connexion with one branch of industry, 'We must have cheap watches; therefore women must make them:' but this is an argument which surely cannot be expected to have weight with the men who have hitherto made them, and who must feel an, at least, equal necessity for a rate of wages on which they can live with comfort and maintain a wife and family; and it must be remembered that the circumstances which prevent a man from marrying prevent a woman from being married. It strikes us as another of those cases in which the difficulties of our social position are sought to be remedied by bringing man and woman—whose interests are the same, who can only thrive by helping each other—into antagonism. However, this is a wide subject, in which we have space only for a passing opinion.

In leaving this part of our subject, we should be sorry indeed should anything we have said seem to go counter to the very first lesson of this book, that, in order to benefit the poor,—in order to do any effectual service to our fellow-creatures,—we must bring our whole powers to bear upon our work, and do our best to cultivate those powers to the utmost. 'When God uses 'us as His agents to help others, it is by and through the 'natural faculties and talents He has given us, and according to 'the measure and power they have attained through the care 'with which we have exercised them.' It is most important that persons should enter upon this work using their best judgment, and realizing its difficulty, and the necessity of thought and preparation. It is not well, we know, to multiply difficulties—to seem to throw obstacles in the way of what so many already feel irksome: but thought and care for the needy are a sacred obligation; it is surely important to bring our best and highest powers to the task, and work with all our heart and understanding. And this brings us to the next book on our list.

Quoting from our own pages, and from the same article, the authoress whose work we have just discussed, at one time charges us with being blind to the higher duties of her sex, and at another accuses us of setting women on work better, if not exclusively, fitted for men.

'People are apt to write as though ladies' work must be perfect, and, not unfrequently, as though it were equally applicable to all cases. A writer in the "Christian Remembrancer" proposes that because the unruly young men, the "shacking" lads of the north, are in most parishes the most baffling portion of the clergyman's flock, they should be turned over to the gentle influence of daughters at home: and this on the strength of "English Hearts and Hands,"

as though we were all Miss Marshes; or as though there were no such people known as educated young men to take the part of Captain Vickers, and fulfil their natural relations to their uneducated contemporaries.'—*Ibid.* p. 14.

If the authoress had read our remarks with any attention before founding an argument upon them, she would have seen that Miss Marsh did not furnish the ground for them. But to quote the exact words:—'We were led to these thoughts some 'time since by the knowledge of a most successful effort of this 'kind by a lady in an agricultural district, working under the 'encouragement and support of her pastor. Most interesting 'and affecting details have reached us of the happy fruit of her 'labours;'—the writer going on to say that he feared further to indicate their nature or locality, lest he should seem to intrude on the privacy of a strictly parochial work. Since then, as Mr. Legard's preface tells us, the friends of this lady have induced her to publish some of the letters and other documents by which, in the course of her exertions, she had sought to excite their interest, and to call the attention of others to the moral and spiritual condition of the whole district in which lay her own sphere of labour. 'Ploughing and Sowing' is the result—a work of so little literary pretension that it must rather be called a collection of letters and documents than a book, using that word as conveying the idea of deliberate authorship, but which, on the other hand, contains so much that is new to most readers, is really such a revelation of a state of society, is written in so intelligent, candid, and earnest a spirit, that we know no work of the kind better worth reading. If the whole is put together without attempt at literary effect, each page is written with a purpose, is the fruit of a progressive experience, and expresses what the writer feels of vital importance in a clear, strictly simple, and yet cultivated style. It is curious, too, as a contribution to the study of race. A great many of our readers probably know more of the habits of the polar bear than of the Yorkshire farming lad, who, so far as this lady sees him and has to do with him, is vividly brought before us, while she never allows imagination to fill up the void where positive knowledge fails. We do not know all about him, but we have full confidence that everything we are told comes fresh from an observation which adds no running commentary, no flattering gloss, but sees things as they are.

And, for ourselves, we must own that a strong interest is excited. She can describe ignorance without conveying any ideas of contempt. We see through the density that force and vigour of mind which have advanced Yorkshire to so forward a place amongst the shires, that undeniable power of work and will

which will always make men foremost in whatever they undertake, and which constitute Yorkshiremen the best labourers in the world. It is really affecting to see these sons of the soil, after such a day's work as is accomplished nowhere else, resolutely apply their unpractised, and therefore slow brains, to the mysteries of letters, and spelling, and books. It is delightful to see the dulness clear up, and by degrees the power of expression dawn upon them, to see the almost heroic stolidity which dictated the reply, 'Working and sleeping are enough for me,' give way to the wish to learn. It is pleasant, too, to trace a dogged truthfulness even in the least promising. Nothing shirking or dishonest, even as an individual characteristic, throws a doubt on the reality of seeming good. The lady and her readers both know where they are. The respect, and consequent sense of equality, that sincerity on each side brings, is one of the most agreeable points we have to rest upon. The 'I said I would send you no lies,' of her correspondent, to which she can confidently reply, 'I always knew you would tell me no lies,' if it does not make a difficult work easy, at least guarantees those who would labour in this field from the worst form of disappointment. The independence of position, as well as of character in these youths, tends, no doubt, to sincerity, by making it easier than the underpaid, often depressed labourer of less favoured districts. The Yorkshire unmarried farming lad lives on the fat of the land. His master lodges him in his house, and, in exchange for the full use of his strength, engages to feed him abundantly, in order to maintain that strength at its height. Meat three times a-day, and other things in proportion, make it easier to hold your own, and preserve from the more timid forms of insincerity, however unfavourably full feeding may affect the character in other ways, and to have the physical strength developed to the utmost, while the moral and spiritual natures are left without their needful aliment. The following pictures, with which the book opens, give us a very distinct idea of the manner of life in the agricultural districts of the East Riding, and of the class for whose cause it is written. It is as well to premise that the describer is daughter of the rector of the parish, and, what is inferred but never distinctly stated, niece of the landowner, a position or advantage, which must lend powerful aid even to the highest personal qualifications, and which constitute this lady's whole course of action, one more for general, than close and particular imitation.

'*July*, 1856.

'This is a very scattered parish, entirely agricultural. I do not know if in any other part of England the population and customs are quite similar. Every farm (there are twelve in this parish) comprises in its household from six or seven to twenty plough lads, according to the size of the farm; their

ages varying from about fourteen to four-and-twenty, but the greater part in their teens. These are all changed every year at Martinmas (*i.e.* the last week in November).

'Their masters, as you may suppose from such a system, have very little control over them, the clergyman still less, and they are sadly ignorant and lawless; a large proportion can neither read nor write. One Sunday, seeing ten or a dozen of them together, lounging about a farmyard in their working dress, as if unconscious that it was Sunday and the church bells were ringing, the sight made an impression which has never left me; and since then my thoughts have been constantly bent on schemes for elevating and improving them.

'I cannot hear that in any parish in the district there is an evening school; only that several clergymen have attempted it, and have failed entirely.

'Every farmhouse that I go into, I hear the same story. The master and mistress (strange misnomers!) have no control whatever over their servants, except in their actual work: this is abundantly evident, but where does the fault lie? Surely with us all; not only with the employers themselves, but with the so-called Christian people, who live round about, and make no effort, or not all that they might do, to remedy this state of things; but in the first instance, I think, the blame rests most with the farmers and their wives, in having that number of young servants in their house, and not living amongst them, quite forgetting that in every gentleman's house, where there is anything like that number of young servants, there are upper servants, male and female, whose first duty it is to keep order in the household; whereas, in a farmhouse, the foreman, who is the only person even supposed to have any authority in the kitchen, is very frequently under twenty, and seldom more than twenty-three.

'Seeing is believing. I had heard all my life, with the hearing of the ear, that farmhouse life was "so demoralizing." I had also heard pretty much what were its evils and dangers, but till I saw it with my own eyes last Thursday evening, at seven o'clock, I never really believed it; not that I doubted it, but I never believed it in any true sense till I saw it. This was how it happened—I went into a farmhouse parlour, and stayed for a few minutes talking with its inmates; then down a passage to the farmhouse kitchen, to talk to *its* inmates, consisting of seven young men and youths, and three young women, who had all just finished supper; the girls were "washing up," the lads were sitting on benches about the kitchen or near the fire; there was no housekeeper, no older person with them—that is just what I saw, and just what takes place every evening of their lives; except that my coming amongst them on this occasion made a little difference, perhaps even a great difference, and something of a sensation.'—*Ploughing and Sowing*, pp. 1—3.

A week after, not allowing first impressions to lose their power and first ardour to cool, she made what she calls "a bold plunge." How and when to make such a plunge, and the principles which guide such a first effort, often indicate the degree of fitness for exceptional work.

'I am just now in the position of one who has plunged into deep water, and must sink or swim. I have this very evening walked straight into a farmhouse kitchen, among the assembled lads, and told them I will teach them if they will come, and they nearly all say they will. Five I am pretty sure of; and I should not much wonder if I have nearly a dozen to start with.

'I am wholly inexperienced in adult teaching, and have so few notions of how to set about it, that I should not have ventured on it yet, or perhaps ever, if so many things had not seemed to lead to it, and to show and to tell me that now was the time. My father has encouraged, and I know will help me; but in the

first instance I believe it will devolve mostly on myself. I was much pleased by the way my offer was met; the grateful surprise, the shy but earnest thanks, the fears that I should find them so dull, &c., and this, when I had half expected only surly or insolent replies.

'It almost took from me the power to speak.'—*Ibid.* pp. 4, 5.

She had no reason to complain of her scholars. When harvest came, during which they work early and late, she prepared to dismiss her night class for the season; but some begged to continue for a while longer with an earnestness she could not refuse, though doubting the wisdom of it; adding, 'One of 'them was so weary and exhausted, yet made such efforts to 'learn and understand. It goes to the heart to see their eager-'ness to learn and acquire new ideas, and to think how few 'opportunities they have!' The sight of this eagerness naturally awoke a feeling for the whole class, out of which arose a correspondence with friends, lay and clerical, amongst others with the editor, himself experienced in the same work, and so well aware, as we gather from his preface, of its difficulty, as to be quite willing that 'woman's influence' should be brought to bear upon it. The book this lady chose for her more intelligent pupils is so singular a one as to throw great light on the nature of the teaching, while it still seems to limit her successful imitators to a small class. Let any ordinary teacher take 'Rasselas' as a first reading book, and see how far he can engage his pupils' attention.

'The book I have been reading a little of every day, with three or four of the most advanced, is "Rasselas." I doubt whether I could well have chosen a better.

'It strikes me every day, how little likely it is that they should derive much good from such reading as they have time for, without a little more previous knowledge of the language in which books are written. I believe many people would hardly credit how few words they are acquainted with; and "Rasselas" contains such an unusually large proportion of those in common use derived from the Latin, that it is, if only for that reason, a very good lesson book. A page or so generally contains as many new words as there is any hope of their learning the meaning of in one day. Fancy their not being able to attach an idea to any of the following—*bestow, impart, conceal, pursue, repose;* so you may imagine their utter darkness as to *eminence, magnificence, accumulations, vicissitudes*, &c. They did not even know the word "*captivity*," so often occurring in the Bible.

'When unfolding the meaning of a word, and the different ways in which it is used, and watching their eager faces the while, I often feel how right Mr. Trench is in saying that "a young man's first discovery of the fact, that words are living powers, is like the acquiring of a new sense, the introduction into a new world." And this is just the thing first of all wanting for them: the awakening of intellectual interests; the showing that, in a few books well chosen, there may be found sources of better and higher enjoyment than in the ale-house; that the world contains, even for them, something less besides hard work, varied only by sensual pleasure or utter vacancy. And with rather a discursive book like "Rasselas" to go upon, you may give your teaching almost any tone or turn you like; as, for instance, when the

word *impulse* suggested the difference between acting on impulse, on reason, and on principle; or where the prince, sceptical at first of the mechanist's power to make wings with which to fly, catches the *contagion* of his confidence; showing that there is a moral *infection* (they knew that word) of hope or fear, gladness or sadness, good or evil.'—P. 7.

Instruction like this implies a vigilant sympathy, clearness of illustration, and undeviating attention on the teacher's part, and a willingness to mental labour in the pupil not common on either side. We feel the contrast between this and routine teaching, by which the supple mind of childhood commonly acquires its first knowledge. A neglected plough-boy has no affinity with routine. No mechanical method can find an opening to his brain. There must be a contact of mind; he must be always conscious of labour in his teacher exacting labour in return. Nothing slips in unconsciously or by chance. As far as we can judge, however, often as she changes her scholars, she never has to complain of indifference to learning under the stimulus of her teaching. It was the easiest of her tasks to bring them together after a hard day's work to tax their unpractised faculties. Indeed, the respect for knowledge never really slumbers in the midst of the dense ignorance of which she complains. Here and there one had taught himself to read, and in the throng of harvest were others who 'snatched half an hour more than they ought from their night's rest,' but whose ardour she dare not damp by a refusal. On the prevailing ignorance, she thus writes:—

'Adult education in villages seems at the present crisis to be almost more needed than even that of children; so little can be done with children unless you have the concurrence of the parents, and can hope that the training and discipline of school will be in some degree carried out at home.

'This, while the parents remain what most cottage parents are, seems hopeless, and to effect an entire change in their habits equally so.

'It is with those who are old enough to understand, and young enough to be impressible, that the work of improvement, to be effectual, should begin; and yet the poor farming lads in every country parish seem to be almost given up as a lost case!

'In many there is at that age a longing for light, an eager desire for knowledge, which soon dies of starvation; and if left as they are, by the time they are married men with families, they will value education as little for their children as their own parents valued it for them.

'The heathen ignorance of our working population, whether in town or country, must appal any who come into such contact with it, as the teacher, rather than the preacher, alone can do. I do not think it can be too much to say that the majority of this class, as regards knowledge of the first principles of Christianity, are almost heathens. Out of ten plough-lads that I was teaching on Sunday, there was only one that had any notion connected with Christmas beyond a general holiday—that is, who knew at all why it is observed. One or two that I have taught, not only had no distinct knowledge (as indeed very few had) of what our Saviour has done for us, but did not even know who He is; had never heard (so they assured me) that He was the Son of God!

'Out of curiosity, I have asked most of them if they knew what a heathen meant. I have only met with two who knew at all.

'Too truly might such plead, "We can none of us read, and have no man to guide us."

'If I tell them they should go to church, I am answered that they understand nothing if they do; and this is true. Only those who have taught them can know how very few words they are possessed of, and how large a proportion of those in common use are as unintelligible to them as a foreign language. As to sermons, where is the clergyman who ever preaches one of which every line is not Hebrew to them? It appears to be an impossibility for a classically-educated clergyman to adapt his language to the untaught.' —P. 11.

Of course, such ignorance as she goes on to describe is exceptional in England; but we believe the same searching investigation applied in many other quarters would let out facts that would surprise the world. In a letter to a friend, she writes:—

'To give some notion of the ignorance in which the young have been suffered to grow up in this East Riding, I will tell you of one or two which you will think extreme cases, as indeed they are, but by no means exceptional or uncommon. I was telling a lad in his teens, the other day, the story of Adam and Eve, but had not gone far when a thought seemed to strike him, and looking up he said, "Is Adam alive now?" "No," said I; "it was Adam's sins that first brought death into the world; Adam died and turned to dust, as all men have done since, but we shall all live again." "Yes," he said, "I know that, but (he continued with a puzzled look) I once heard a man say there was one left alive, and all the rest was drowned, and I thought perhaps it was Adam."

'Another I was talking to about the first truths of religion, and they seemed so new to him that I asked, in surprise, "Did you never hear of Jesus Christ before?" "Yes," he said, "I have heard tell of Him, but I never heard He had been put to death." Still more amazing, in a Christian land so full of churches, another told me he had heard of Jesus Christ, but had never heard He was the Son of God! Of a large number I was teaching, one Christmas, very few knew at all why the day is observed.

'Still fewer are those who know why we keep Easter, though they tell you and firmly believe that the sun rises twice on Easter Sunday. None have seen it themselves, but many knows some one who has; and one assured me that his mother had seen the sun dance up and down on Easter Sunday morning.' —P. 90.

'Another time, a youth of sixteen whom I met with, told me he had had in his life one quarter's schooling; he could make out little words, and could say the Lord's Prayer, but hardly seemed to attach any meaning to it. How should he? I tried to explain it to him, and other things that were evidently quite new to him. He did not know who Jesus Christ was. If you had talked to him you would have seen that it really was so. I asked him about his home. He was one of fourteen, in wretched poverty—the father, I should think, unsteady, the mother in weak health. I said I hoped that now he was able to earn something he would help them. He answered, "I shall always try to help my mother." I asked him if he would come the next Sunday; yes, that he would, but he did not. I asked the others why. He had been coming, they said, but his master had sent him to "tent pigs." Of course such as he are not to be seen in church. I doubt whether they would derive much good if they went. It would all be like a strange language. Without having had to do with such, no one would suppose how needful some previous teaching is to make the service intelligible.'—P. 27.

And shortly after,—

'I believe few of the better educated would believe, without an actual knowledge of the facts, how nearly approaching to heathenism is the state of at least nine-tenths of the "farming lads" of this part of Yorkshire. Not only do they live entirely without prayer or any kind of worship, but most of them are in actual ignorance of the first principles of Christianity, and totally unacquainted with even the outlines of the Old or New Testament history. A large class of them that I gathered together yesterday (Sunday) nearly all assured me that they had never before heard the story of Judas Iscariot or of Peter's denial, and they were equally in ignorance of the stories of Abraham and Joseph. One told me the other day he did not think he had ever heard of Adam; he had heard of Abraham, and thought he was the first man.'—P. 28.

It was by degrees that what she justly calls the heathenism of this class dawned upon her; and here we think the prevalent system and the nature of the connexion between master and servant in this part of the country, which has been already alluded to, must largely bear the blame. The rule is for the farm servants throughout the East Riding to be changed every year. As men are constituted, this must produce mutual indifference. It requires a real enthusiasm of benevolence to care a great deal—to take daily trouble for a constantly shifting household. The actual state of things seems to us also the natural one, that each party should regard the contract as a merely business one; as such it appears to be honestly observed. The work is well done, the master does his part, but religion and morality are not in the bond.

The mere spectacle of the hiring is not encouraging. Duly as Martinmas comes, the market or main streets of the country towns of the district are lined with young men and also with young women, strapping healthy girls, set off in their showiest and least tasteful finery, standing to be looked at and to be hired. It is more like a slave market than any English scene could be supposed to be except for the jollity and independence of the article exposed for the year's purchase. The season of absolute unrestraint is found to produce the worst consequences. The clergy in different places set themselves against the system wholly or in part, but it is an institution so deeply rooted, and with so many conveniences which are felt,—perhaps, amongst these is, the relief from the sense of responsibility,—while the evils are either disregarded or treated as inevitable, that the farmers set themselves against any change.[1] Even our authoress sees some advantages in it. The week's holiday, which now

[1] In one town this autumn, the more flagrant breach, as it seems to strangers, of feminine reserve and decorum has received a check. It was proposed to set apart the Corn-Exchange for the young women, carefully excluding all men but those who came to hire. This was regarded beforehand as a doubtful experiment—no one could guess how the young women would take this invasion of the old prescriptive right of flirtation; but they fell into the new order of things with a good grace, and seemed glad of the change.

comes with Martinmas, keeps up home ties which might otherwise languish, and she naturally fears that, if the annual hirings were given up, the holiday might go with it; while in her own case she accepts the constant change of pupils as an advantage both as a stimulus to exertion in the year's class, as knowing the shortness of the time, and as a means of spreading her influence for good by her former pupils: the number under her immediate control being necessarily limited by the distance of many of the farms, even in her father's parish.

'It is only a very small number I can collect for the week-day evening class, from the farms being so scattered. For those few, it is doubtless a very good thing. My father always gives them a quarter of an hour's Bible lesson, the rest of the teaching I have to myself, and I always have them for an hour and a half on Sunday, along with a good many from more distant farms, and have lately induced a good many to go to church who had never thought of such a thing before, so I hope by Martinmas the account I have given will not be applicable to *them* any longer. I also teach them to read and write, and tell them a few facts about the world and its wonders, the heavens and the earth, the past and the present, which I hope will tend to open their minde, and make more important things more comprehensible.'—P. 29.

As her acquaintance with her pupils increased, it became apparent that mere teaching in classes could not reach the exigencies of the case. Of what use was mere learning, or even Bible knowledge while there was the habitual neglect of the first act of religion—prayer—either public or private. Only by degrees can this come home to the religiously educated woman, who, from infancy, has assumed that prayer in a Christian land, at least, is an universal outward act. The real shock that comes with the knowledge that it is not so, that many never pray, may have made a woman in this case the best instrument. There is something very remarkable in the difficulty she found, often in her best pupils, to induce them even to an external observance. General exhortations were ineffectual; she found it essential to reach the conscience by a particular, individual approach. To one of her pupils she writes:—

'Dear Thomas,—Almost all that I said to the lads, both here and at C——, last Sunday, was about praying.

'When I first began to teach any of you last summer, I never thought but that you all said your prayers to God night and morning. If any one had told me then what I have heard since, that hardly any in farmhouses ever pray, I should have thought it so wicked, it would have made me very unhappy.

'I should have thought that such lads surely could not love God at all, if they would not come to Him, when in His Word He has so often bidden us all to do so, and promised the best blessings, both for this life and the next, if we will ask for them.

* * * * * *

'It is no wonder that those who do not pray do such wicked things, for temptations come to all of us; and how can we stand against them without God's help?

'I know it must be much more difficult for farming lads to pray than it is

for me. I know how many are prevented by the fear of being laughed at; but think of what the Apostles of our Lord had to bear; how they were beaten and put in prison, and how they *rejoiced that they were counted worthy* to suffer shame for His sake. I think it is only just at first that the fear of shame would make it hard for any to pray; even if they did not cease to care for it, they would soon find that the blessings of prayer far more than made up for that.

'I had a letter from a clergyman the other day, who, speaking of how very many did such things, said, "It is high time that something should be done, or we may have the curse of God on us."

'He thought that a clergyman could do very little to make farm servants better, but that their masters and mistresses might do more; but the masters and mistresses say, "If they will do wrong, we can't hinder them;" and no doubt this is partly true, though I think they might hinder some things more than they do. Perhaps some of the lads and girls would say, "We have so much temptation, there is so much to lead us wrong, we cannot keep in the right way, even when we wish;" and no more they can unless they pray; nor even perhaps then, if they only pray when the temptation comes, unless they have been *used* to pray every day of their lives, "Lead us not into temptation."'—P. 45.

The difficulty in their case of beginning this practice when once broken off is enormous: even some who went to church shrank from it, and would make no promises, though believing in the necessity. 'I cannot be right some way, or I could pray,' is the confession. Where prayer has ceased to be even a form, we can imagine the awe which may inspire a sincere mind in the first effort. To some of these lads, the scruple seems to have been of the nature which so often deters from receiving the Holy Communion. Even going down on their knees is a profession, especially where, as in their case, it must be done in the sight of scoffing companions. She is writing to one Thomas, of his friend W. J., who had been in peril of death from an accident. The letter gives us an insight into the nature of her intercourse with former pupils, whom she was most anxious to keep some hold over.

'I went to see him every day, and when he was well enough I read some Psalms and chapters of the Testament to him, and talked to him about them. Before he hurt himself he had sometimes walked part of the way home with me on Sundays, after church. One Sunday I told him what I had been writing to you about praying, and I hoped he would think about it. When he was getting better from his hurt, I said a great deal more to him about it. He told me that he still never prayed. I was very sorry, and begged of him all that I could to promise me he would, but he would not promise.

'This grieved me very much. For some days I could not get over it, or help thinking about it. He would do anything else I asked him. He comes to read with me on Sundays now, but it makes me sad to think that he will not be much better, even for reading the Bible, until it leads him to pray.

'I do not know that I should have told you all this, but for something he said one day when he was laid up. I said to him, "Surely Thomas M. used to pray" He answered, "He never did, Ma'am, that I seed."[1]

'As soon as I had asked him, I was sorry I had, and felt that I ought to have asked you yourself, if I asked anyone; and as I told William, we could not be

[1] They had slept in the same room.

sure that you never prayed, even if you did not pray at night. I am afraid you will not like my having asked him; but now, Thomas, I want you not only to forgive me that, which I think you will, but to tell me, not whether you have prayed before, but that you pray now, or that you will from this time.[1] I have said all that I could about it to many others, and though a great many would not, eight have said they will. One of these has since owned to me that he has not kept his promise; but I am sure that most have kept it.

'One of these is L. D. I did not ask him to promise, but I said a great deal to him about it, and one day he told me he had started. I told you that he had quite left off coming to church, or to read with me, but he does both now. You will wonder how I can talk to so many, as only a few come in the evenings; but I go to the field where they are at work, and walk alongside of their ploughs and harrows.'—P. 50.

The last sentence brings us to the most remarkable feature of this lady's work. It is mainly carried on in the fields. The necessity of private conversation drove her to the only chance for obtaining it, by seeking her scholars in the solitude of their daily toil. There seems rarely to have been any objection on the part of these boys to so unusual a companion, or to being thus forced, as it were, to serious thought; though we observe in her Introduction that she does not profess the book to give an adequate idea of the failures and discouragements that accompanied her efforts. In the instances recorded she is evidently welcome. The work is so far mechanical that conversation can be carried on with only occasional interruption; and we seldom observe in them any unwillingness to mental labour. Of course, this could only go on where there is a strong sense of mutual fitness and some similarity of temperament. The two labourers walk side by side, alike strenuous, and determined to overcome the obduracy and difficulties of the respective soils. We see that anything short of her perseverance and importunity would not do. Her will is resolute to overcome theirs. Having established a hold, she never relaxes. All, we presume (only presume), are Yorkshire together —all endued with the same strong wills, strong characters, and native intelligence—all with the same sense of loyalty and duty to the work they have undertaken, and which in each case is accepted as the work of life. Nor do we observe, what we should certainly have apprehended, any objection on the master's side. She is permitted, with one strong exception, to pursue her task unimpeded—an immunity which, of course, can only be attributed to joint respect for the lady's character and position. That, under other circumstances, farmers would like to have mission-ladies walking by the side of their ploughs and harrows, is not to be supposed, even if we did not find direct mention of annoyance in one case where the master supposed her a stranger,

[1] He wrote back, 'I have prayed every day ever since you gave me that book—that called "Plain Words about Prayer."'

which gave way to marked attention on further recognition. She, on her part, is careful not to interfere with work, and would not pursue a conversation with one who rested on his scythe till he explained to her that he was doing piece-work. We mention this point, however, to show how very exceptional efforts precisely in this form must be. The scene and the circumstances in which this work is carried on constitute the book, instinct as it is with rustic life, an idyll. A fresh country air breathes through it, and the scent of new-turned earth. We accompany her unflinching in the keen winter winds, and sympathise with the refreshment of happy autumn fields, thus sweetly touched upon in a vein of feeling not often indulged. She is writing (August, 1858) to a friend in the pause of harvest holidays, and describing the course of her days, and the nature of 'field work.'

'My way lies through a grove of ancient trees, where I sometimes read the Psalms and Lessons as I go along, if I have not done so before, and make a last pause at the top of the hill, where you emerge from the shade into the sunny fields, wherein my day's work lies; and having first collected and arranged my thoughts for what I have to say and do, before exchanging thought for action, I stand for a little space, just long enough to take in a day's supply of such inner sustenance as is brought to us through outward things, Nature's mysterious beauty of mingled sights and sounds, and the breezes' soul searching whisper that speaks unutterable things. I am often thankful my life's work does not lie in town streets instead of in the corn fields. Such pauses when our minds are full of purpose and action give us more than an hour's dream of purposeless enjoyment, even of nature, and give added fervour to the prayer, more condensed than would be any words of my own, and therefore best then:

> "Direct, control, suggest this day,
> All I design, or do, or say,
> That all my powers, with all their might,
> In Thy sole glory may unite."

'There is not one among the youthful labourers (numbering towards fifty) who live in the farmhouses at C. and B. with whose character, disposition, tendencies, and amount of knowledge or ignorance, I am not now perfectly acquainted, though they were total strangers to me when they came in November; and next November will be exchanged for an entirely different set; but with many of these young hearts I have this year formed a friendship which, I trust, will last for life, though I dare say I shall have but little intercourse with them by letter, for they make but badly out with writing. It is a sad trouble to them, and they have little time and opportunity, very happily for me, or I might in time find the correspondence with those who have left rather an overwhelming item in my work. But this summer I have had a good many Sunday visits from those who were in the parish last year, and are now at farms within ten or twelve miles from this; and some I have seen from even a greater distance, who have walked all the way.

'What my field work is cannot easily be described; but, to put it in a few words, it is getting at their minds and hearts by various means to awaken and influence them. The first few months it is little more than making acquaintance with them, now for some time it has been exhorting, instructing, warning, counselling, consoling, encouraging, as the case may be. This is all by means of talk while they are at work; but this summer time, till harvest began, there

was always an hour's rest after dinner, and sometimes I have read to a group of them sitting under a hedge, or in a great empty barn, half-way between here and C., which is very high and cool, and so dark that first going in from the sunshine you are hardly able to see, which is very pleasant this weather. When I go in they will be stretched out at rest on a great heap of chaff at the further end, but rouse up; and G. M., who deserves to be signalized by name for his gallantry, will heap up the dry chaff to make a comfortable seat for me, and spread his great coat at the top; and there I sit reading and commenting on the words of life to listeners in various attitudes, generally ending with some hymns. After that I must hurry homewards for our two o'clock dinner.

'The afternoons I generally spend in an arbour (as now) or under the shade of the lime-trees that bound our garden, writing (always till to-day in their behalf) things that I think they will not remember sufficiently if only said to them, or that I could not say so well in talking. I often[1] write many copies of the same papers, or lessons, for dispersion, in better writing than this you may be sure, or none of them could read it. Often in printing letters; and when it is only mechanical copying, one of my sisters will often read to me, which is all the reading for my own exclusive pleasure I ever get now. After tea, three evenings in the week, I have had till this week my quiet little evening school here at home of only six or seven from the farms close by. I thoroughly enjoy teaching them; they are such a very nice set this year, coming so regularly, and so attentive and affectionately respectful. Three of them (all turned twenty) could not read at all when they came.'—P. 112.

We cannot resist, in connexion with the youths here spoken of, giving, in her own words, a very striking and affecting scene, showing, as it does, her power, and some of the secrets of her power, over rude and untaught natures. The account was written in the beginning of the same year 1858, shortly, that is, after the Martinmas hiring. Her own department in it would be of especial value as an example to those youths who feel laughter and ridicule the most terrible of all trials;—and one she had constantly to combat, and with different success. Some to all her arguments for not caring would doggedly hold to it that they did care a great deal, while another, of a higher spirit, declared his own resolution, and helped her with a motto of encouragement, in the words, 'I'm not afraid of them; they are only men.'

'You will wish to know how it was at C. on Sunday. I had been the day before to an out-lying farm at the furthest extremity of the parish from C., talking to two or three who were ploughing. I had been to them several times since Martinmas, and hoped in time to make some impression on them; but they seemed so hardened there was little to give any hopes of them, though one, seeing how pained I was, said half-compassionately, "I wouldn't make a trouble of it if I was you."

'I went home, feeling very sad and more depressed than I had been for a long time, and could not shake off the impression. I woke very early next morning, and had several quiet hours before breakfast. There was morning service at B., and the Sacrament, and directly after I went to C.

'All the morning I had felt a strange unnatural calmness, almost as if I was in a dream, and none of the agitating hopes and fears as to the probable result of my experiment at C. that I had had the week before. I found two or three

[1] 'This letter was written before I got a printing press.'

steady lads looking out for me, who walked with me to the place appointed. There were a great many about, and I spoke to several, and asked if they were coming—"they didn't know," "maybe they might," "they'd see." So I went in with my two or three, and in a minute or two looked out to see if any more were coming. Some were dragging others by main force, or bringing back those who were running away, and the rest looking on. I went out and spoke to one or two, and said I hoped they were coming, for it was a pity to waste so much time, and then went back to those who were sitting still by the fire, one of whom said, "I think, Ma'am, perhaps they're shy." So I went out again and spoke to them, and said to a young foreman of two or three-and-twenty, who was among them, "Do try and get some of them to come in." A minute or two after he and the whole set came in together—the room was quite full; I had never had so many before. Some looked wild and rough enough, and some very sheepish. I said I was very glad so many had come. I was afraid some of them had thought very little about religion before; but I hoped their coming then showed they wished to make a fresh start and do better, but that even reading and hearing the Bible would not make them any better unless they prayed for God's help, which I was afraid very few of them ever did; but I would say over to them a short prayer, that they might know what it was, and then they should all kneel down and say it after me from their hearts. So I repeated it to them standing. I heard some laughing, but took no notice, hoping it would subside; and then they all knelt down, but only one or two voices said it after me, and many of the others were laughing very audibly. It was then I felt the value of that strange calmness that was given me. I spoke very gravely, and told them how wrong and sinful it was, and they must begin again and all say it after me. Two or three more voices joined this time, but there was still a great deal of laughing; so I spoke to them again, and tried again and again, till at last *every voice joined with mine*, and so solemnly, that my calmness then almost gave way. From that moment I had no more trouble. I asked if any of them would like to have a copy of the prayer; a good many held up their hands, and I took down their names. We had not time for a great deal of reading, but I felt there was a blessing on it, and on what I said. A few went with me to church, but not many.'—P. 88.

There are many scenes as well worth reading—the story of John and Betsey, the death of J. L., the walk to a distant confirmation, which was to test her powers. The boys are always willing enough to be confirmed for the sake of the holiday; but as for getting them to return in order and in good time, that was regarded as simply impossible. 'Oh, yes,' said a farmer; 'we 'll tell 'em, but see if you get 'em back before midnight. How'll you do it? you can't force 'em.' She heard her folly and simplicity made a joke of. Even the schoolmaster advised the boy and girl candidates walking separately, not trusting to the lads' sense of decorum, till his scruples were overruled, and he was brought to regard the walk in company as a lesson in proper behaviour. The result was triumphant, the success complete, as far, that is, as the day was concerned; her disappointments were to come from another source. We should assume this lady's personal influence unbounded over her scholars but for the following spirited remonstrance, which is inserted, no doubt, to show that she is not without some rubs

and slights, and also to illustrate the effect of relapse into evil courses on the behaviour. It is addressed to a backslider.

'Do you think I liked going into the farmyard as I did on Monday, talking to you in the stable, following you about the yard, trying to make you hear me? No; it was what no lady could like. I never disliked anything much more, but I did it for your sake, because I felt I would do anything to save you; and if you had felt about it as a man ought to feel, you would have seen this, and have been ashamed and grieved that I should have had to do it for you; but you did not see it nor feel it, and I will tell you why. It was because sin had hardened and blinded your heart. Do you remember the Bible lesson I wrote for you about the chief butler who forgot the kindness Joseph had shown him in prison, and never thought of him again? I said that so it was with those who are living without the grace of God; the things they ought most to feel are hid from them; they never give them a thought. I said if they will not speak to the Heavenly Father, to whom they owe every blessing, we need not wonder that they forget their earthly friends, and make a bad return for their kindness and their love. It is a small thing that you treat me in this way, though I have been a kind friend to you, as far as I knew how to be; but it is a fearful thing to treat God as you have treated me, and that is what you are doing.'—P. 78.

Our readers need hardly be told what is the great blot, the prevailing vice, of the locality and the class to which these pages introduce us. This writer, in one place, wonders how it is that some ladies who write on the poor seem to treat drunkenness as the chief sin, the one overpowering evil. With the young, at any rate, this is not the case in the scene of her labours. She could not go on long, scarcely enter upon her work in earnest, without having to settle with her own mind the course she must pursue, whether to relinquish her work altogether, or to overcome what must be called more than scruples. In the almost stern simplicity of the mind before us, the decision was soon made.

'December 7th, 1857.

'My dear S.,—Among those letters to T. M. there was one that I have sometimes wondered whether you would think had better not have been written. I am sure you must know of the frightful immorality that prevails among young farm servants; but perhaps from not having it so often brought before you, it may not have made such an impression on you as it has on me. From the time I began to have any dealings with them, I felt that all I could do or say for their good and instruction would be worse than wasted, unless (while they were still just too young to have been led into it themselves) I could bring home to their hearts and consciences the great sinfulness of the sin they all learn to think so lightly of. Every day I felt more strongly, on the one hand, the necessity laid on me, and, on the other hand, the impossibility of my doing this; but I think in my place you would have felt as I did, more and more, that it was the impossibility that must give way. That letter was about the second attempt I ever made, and I have made one or two others since by word of mouth; but you can hardly fancy what it cost me, and worst of all was the fear that it might possibly do harm instead of good. Without entering into all this you would hardly understand the inexpressible joy and thankfulness that a little incident the week before Martinmas caused me.'—P. 69.

And then follows an instance where her words had proved an effectual check and warning. Under this lady's handling, we are

satisfied that her course was a right one. It may show that her mission altogether is an individual one; but, in this case, the treatment of the whole question—the tone so severe, so pure, so emphatically earnest—constitutes one main value of this little book. Step by step she accepts the responsibilities of her position as teacher and adviser of these lads, who had practically no other, that is, none with the same access to their minds and knowledge of their temptations; she felt that to do them good, she must of all things be straightforward and have no half confidences. She could not, for example, go on teaching spiritual religion while she knew the plainest morals were in danger, and even the conscience in this matter obscured. Nothing could be taught these fellows by remote allusion, they have not the training for it; they must be approached in direct language; and then the more direct, with scriptural plainness and severity as the guide, the better. Where there is weight of character and of standing to support the reproof, where the authority is recognised and the influence already established, the necessary conditions are secured; and the warning or rebuke is the more effectual, if horror of sin as hateful to God and men is shown to overcome for a time all minor respects. While such revelations reach us from all sides of cruel neglect and indifference, of negligent masters and mistresses, as in this case; of ill-lodging and hideous overcrowding, as the reports of the Farringdon Union just now bring to light—no one can say where the chief sin lies; whether with those who commit it, or with those who, having the remedy in their power, have done nothing to prevent it; but while the reproach continues, something should be done to meet the gigantic evil besides apportioning the blame, though we feel and acknowledge the difficulty and are alive to the danger. There is too much public talk of a certain kind, obtrusive noisy talk, provoking unhallowed curiosity; but in grave warning and precaution we believe very little is said. The whole class of sins is not made a matter of teaching at all, scarcely by allusion. When we hear constant lamentations of the continuance, some say the increase, of immorality, in spite of Sunday school and other teaching (and it is a constant reproach to Sunday schools especially), we come to consider how is this danger met. Is it not extremely likely that many a boy or girl whose home lies in the midst of contamination has never heard one single allusion or warning from his or her teacher against the sin that surrounds him? That home and school are consequently such absolutely different worlds, that the instructions of the school hardly take hold of or apply at all to home trials? A few solemn, weighty, plain words of

warning might tell, if the teacher were competent to pronounce them. It is sad to hear of these Yorkshire youths not comprehending the words of Bible warnings for want of being taught, and of a girl under her mistress's reproaches flippantly answering, 'Why you think as much of it as if it was stealing or murder;' but we own to a jealousy of committing such a task to the ordinary class of teachers. Wherever private conversation is possible, this is perhaps the best mode; and the closer different classes approach in sympathy, the more silent influence will tell. It must always be a shame to speak of such things; and when it ceases to be so, the counsellor has lost much of his usefulness, for his sense of sin is blunted. In the particular case before us, it is evident something must be done to rouse the conscience where so general a deadness prevails; and solemn Bible warnings, as much as possible in the very words of Scripture, enforced by an awful belief in those words vividly expressed, seem not only permissible, but essential. Nor is it only by warnings and severity that the evil is met here; there are very tender appeals to the dormant generosity of these youths, and to their innate gallantry. Long as our extracts have been, we must find room for the letter to G. M., on occasion of his having protected some female candidates for Confirmation from the rough ways of his companions.

'Dear George,—I said I should perhaps see you before Thursday, and perhaps I may; but I think some things I have to say can perhaps be better said in writing.

'I have not words to tell you how thankful I was to see you act as you did on Sunday evening. I was thankful and proud to have you for a friend; but now we will not be proud of anything; let us be thankful and humble, never forgetting that we are told, "Let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall."

'But thankful we may be, and ought to be—thankful that you were able to prove to yourself, as well as to others, that you are not only one who will not treat girls with rudeness, but will, as far as you can, guard them from being rudely treated. George, you little know the good that it may be given you to do in this wicked world by that; and I think that God, who orders everything for us, would show us that is what He would have you to do.

'God has given all of us some means of doing good, and we shall have to answer to Him for the way we use them; this we learn from the Parable of the Talents.

'George, it is enough to make anyone's heart sad to think of the way poor young girls are treated in farm places. At first, a girl who has had a good mother, does not like it at all, is shocked, and ashamed, and angry, but she too soon gets not to care, and at last even to like it; and I am sure you are one who would never like her then. But whose fault is it? Is she not more to be pitied than blamed? Was it not those rude lads that spoilt her? And that is not all: God has given shame and shyness to girls as a safeguard, and one who has lost this is no longer safe.

'Dear George, I need say no more. May God give you grace to act always as you did yesterday, and may you be rewarded for it some day with the best blessing either rich man or poor can have in this life—a wife he can honour as

well as love. The same chapter that tells us a wife should obey her husband, tells us the husband should honour his wife, and there can be no lasting true love without it; and this blessing God will not give to those who have not earned it by self-restraint before. Then, dear George, let your confirmation be a solemn vow made to God that, trusting in His help and praying for it always, you may be kept yourself, and keep others, from such sin as we will not speak or think of, and from all that may lead to it; but do not trust in yourself, or some day, when you least think yourself in danger, you will be led away and fall. May God guard and guide you!'—P. 100.

We feel a step is gained when an intimate address of this kind is made with a prospect of its being understood—if the class to which 'George' belongs can enter into this, it ought not to be inaccessible. We regard such a letter as a sign of influence at work, for the writer feels that her words will go home. The letters to her scholars always so impress us; and here we are led to consider how hard it is to establish an actuating influence where persons are separated by wide social distinctions. We are not speaking of influence in any subtle sense, but only as the weight that better knowledge and purer morals should obtain for the teacher, and do obtain where he can get them a real hearing. This book, in the midst of some discouragement, shows this desired contact of mind. It is well to reflect how rare this is—what thought, and labour, and concentration of purpose it needs to acquire it—and then we may the less wonder at the small results so often lamented over from much seeming labour. An application of the full powers of mind and heart can alone gain this influence; those whose services are of a mere mechanical nature, however cheerfully bestowed, must not expect to change the face of things, and to alter the standard of morals and feelings. Take, for instance, the case of many who do systematically devote a certain portion of their time to the poor. How much do they get to know of the people they visit? It is one of the mysteries of classes that social differences of position should raise such iron barriers against intimate knowledge. Even slight distinctions of rank have an effect, which we can scarcely comprehend, as hindrances to a perfect understanding. Persons may meet and hold intercourse day after day, and yet, from this cause, know nothing of each other's inner life and modes of viewing things; but in the broad distinctions of rich and poor, educated and uneducated, the difficulty is felt most sharply. And so it is that many see a great deal of the poor, and know nothing of their minds. And how should they? for how rarely have we a glimpse of their home life! and respect and constraint prevent any chance revelations. Thus the visitor pays a call, and finds the mistress of the house surrounded by her youngest children. She receives him gladly; she willingly answers all

questions; she has no intentional concealments; she probably thinks that what is so familiar to her is evident and open to him; she speaks of the different members of her family; talks of work and wages, school and church, easily and naturally. He goes away knowing so much that he does not know that, in one point, he knows nothing. He forms a fair opinion of the industry, the honesty, and the means of the family, if he is experienced and observant, and their relative standing; but he may still come away, after years of such intercourse, with no more notion of the family tone of feeling than if he had never known them. What they talk of, in what light the great interests of life are regarded, what ideas, what manners prevail round the hearth, he is in the dark about. Are poverty and anxieties the constant theme with all that he finds them to be with the mother? Or are their troubles dismissed with the visitor, and does the family continue to be light-hearted, open to new impressions, touching, by turns, upon gossip, public events, and popular amusements? What is the relation of parents and children, brothers and sisters; what aspect religion assumes where there is a profession; how it influences the moral tone; he can only surmise. What interests, what amuses them, what pleases, what propitiates, what excites gratitude, what lasting grudge,—must be constant matter of guess, with very little chance of guessing right. And still less does he know how the most important and deeply interesting questions to the young, such as our extract treats of, are regarded; for about these there is generally an intentional reserve on both sides. It is the thing the mother never likes to think of; for a lover is a signal of separation, often of diminished means, and the prospect of a daughter-in-law is still worse: and the visitor, by experience, finds the subject of love and courtship so hedged about with trouble and dangers, that he had best not know anything about it.

What a revelation to most of us would an invisible insight, or two or three days of entirely equal intercourse be, in a mechanic's or labourer's family—how it would at once enlarge our charity and modify our expectations to be cooped up with them within those narrow crowded bounds where retirement and reflection seem impossible: to witness in such a new scene the workings of family life—to realize the want of so many aids to refinement and to goodness hitherto taken for granted by us rather than viewed as privileges, and to trace the effect of these privations on their social code, manners, and tempers, and on the requirements of their public opinion. That the poor have a scale of virtues and vices founded on their peculiar trials and temptations, not all in strict conformity with our own, we knew beforehand,

and that to be a kind neighbour, to keep quiet, and to pay your way, is to be respected amongst them, in spite of an occasional lapse in other virtues. Perhaps we have never tried to realise *how* this tolerant moral code is expressed in the family circle, or how it affects the infant mind, only that we may be certain it has affected them before they came under any direct teaching whatever, and that it has affected them, in some degree, as members of a class; for we none of us can help being in a certain degree influenced by the opinions of our equals. When we have thought of all this, and picture what the trials and disadvantages of many a cottage home *must* be, we shall perhaps wonder less that the clergyman or his wife, or the ladies, or the teacher, have spoken in vain, and ask what chance have they against the counter influences of neighbourhood and association, and traditional morals, and the training of a home where *work* is the only discipline. All people will expect so much from direct instruction—they will even expect more effects from instruction to the poor than to their own circle, both because they assume a greater weight of authority where there is superiority of rank and the claims of gratitude, as well as office, and that they are habituated to make allowance for adverse influence where their experience can act, while they are prone to think of the poor only as under this instruction, and to ignore what they do not see: for it needs almost an effort of imagination to follow men into scenes of which we have no personal knowledge.

The present work realizes to the full all these difficulties, from the influences of training, and the earliest imbibed ideas. The only mode of opposing what is objectionable in these is personal direct appeals to the reason, feelings, and conscience; to establish a counter authority, hoping that her work will tell in the next generation on fathers and mothers, who can infuse higher principles. If her words influence these Thomases and Georges now, it may be hoped their daughters will be objects of a more careful and tender watchfulness than fathers or mothers either seem to bestow upon them now. But laxity of moral principle in one great essential point is not the only cause, the only hindrance, raised by traditional ideas; the notion of religion itself, in the class of which she treats, has become a conventional one, and synonymous with the various phases of Methodism. It is clear that the subject of Dissent had not occupied this lady's thoughts much, before she began, or in the first stages of her work. In that part of the country where Methodism is almost the only form of Dissent, it does not take an antagonistic attitude towards the Church. It separates its followers, and causes divisions more in fact than in theory. It is felt more

through empty churches than in the bitterness of polemics. They are Dissenters in act 'without having ever heard the word, or attaching any notion to the idea.' Under these circumstances, our friend might well hope that in bringing her pupils to a sense of religion she was bringing them to Church; and we can fancy the chill that would strike on these hopes as she received the following *naïve* felicitation:—'Have you heard, ma'am, 'that ——, that favourite lad of yours, has grown so good he's 'joined the Primitives, and I believe it's a deal from your talk-'ing to him;' and from this time she found that, in all their seeming indifference, her scholars had imbibed, long before she knew them, a certain notion of religion. Even here she was not first in the field. She could not impart her ideas, she could only give life and vigour to their own, derived in earliest infancy, or at any rate, long before her influence began. She soon found all her instructions increasingly tend to this, and writes upon the words just quoted; 'and if that was the case in one instance last year, it has been in twenty this.' They seemed as if they could not take in any other idea than that to be religious implied being 'converted,' 'brought in,' 'joined,' wound up into a strange state of excitement at some chapel; consequently we find, in a letter to a friend, the following result of the Confirmation, some details of which we have already noticed. It follows on an urgent appeal to the newly-confirmed to receive the Holy Communion, who had in many cases pleaded, 'I'm not good enough.' There was an evident earnestness about them; the plea was not made to put aside an irksome thought, but this duty did not accord with their conventional notions of the soul's progress. Even in her disappointment she adduces it as a proof of sincerity.

'July, 1858.

'There was a great camp-meeting at C., and nearly all those who had lately been confirmed, instead of, as I had hoped, preparing themselves to receive the Lord's Supper in church, joined the Primitives!

'I need not say that this was a blow, but only one of the sort that rouses us to fresh efforts, and seems to put more strength and life into all we say and do. I called a meeting of them one evening in the school-room, to give my thoughts on the subject; a large number attended, not only the lads, but some men who had joined the Wesleyans and Primitives, and were naturally curious to hear what I should say; and fearing that words and courage might fail me, I wrote down what I had to say, and read it to them.'—P. 106.

The book gives us the growth of her ideas on this subject, the consideration of which was more and more forced on her;—the ideas of a practical, and, we may also add, woman's mind engaged in a work, and regarding everything with a view to this work.

'To withstand dissent was never an object I proposed to myself. To ignore it as much as possible was always my wish and aim; but it is becoming almost

universal amongst the labouring class in this part of the country, and I cannot think it is for nothing that its evils have been brought so strongly before me, and my views on the subject made so much clearer than they ever were before; and if I say nothing about it, I am in a manner *making them Dissenters.*'—P. 107.

The subject is treated with real candour and fairness. There is more than toleration,—there is fellow-feeling wherever she recognises practical religion. She brings few doctrinal charges. It is as causing divisions that she mainly attacks Methodism, and she even allows attendance at chapel, where there is no Church, for those boys who would otherwise be left without public worship at all. But her own mind is in strong antagonism to Methodism as the religion of mere feeling, and she meets it in her scholars' minds with definite questions,—'Do you pray?' 'Do you lead pure lives?' 'Do you go to church?' 'Do you communicate?' 'Do you do all these things *now?*'

'I understand now the meaning of the strange answer I have received countless times in the fields when urging them to begin a life of prayer: "It would do me no good." It was in vain I answered, "If God's Word is true, it will do you good."

'Sometimes I have said, "Do you mean always to go on in this way?" and the sad and earnest, "I hope not," did not seem quite like wilfully delaying repentance, so I was puzzled.

'One, in reply to all I could say, exclaimed, "How I wish I could go to chapel and get brought in!" He thought he could not pray till then, and, as there was no chapel at B., he must, perhaps, wait for another year, and I could not persuade him to the contrary. These notions are instilled into them from their cradles, and bound up with all they know of religion.'—P. 107.

Another excused himself for having left off prayer on the plea that when at school he had not been allowed to go to chapel. We insert the argument, and also his letter. The Church services to which he conformed seem to have satisfied some of the natural desires to which Methodism ministers, good singing, and energetic preaching—

'I asked, "Did you not go to church?"

'"Yes."

'"And you think you could not pray at home as well without going to chapel?"

'"No, I couldn't pray unless I could go to chapel."

'I had much conversation with him on the subject, and tried to give him better notions. After he left B. I had several letters from him. The first was as follows:—

'"Dear Madam,—I ofttimes think of what you used to say to me when I was at B., but I never have had time to write to you before, to tell you how I get on. We have left ——, and are now living at M.

'"We have '*strict deed*'[1] at our town. We have church three times a-day, and an organ, and good singing, and good sermons. I should be very glad to see you if I could. If I ever come that way I shall call and see you. I am living with my father at home now. We are keeping a grocer's shop. I am in

[1] '*Strict deed*' means careful, religious ways.

good health now; thank God for it. Our priest[1] I believe, is a converted man, because he bestows so much pains in talking to us all about our souls. I should like for you to hear him. So I must conclude with my kind love.

'"Yours respectfully,

'"———."'

We must be allowed, in passing, to express a hope that letters such as these will never reach the eyes of the writers in their present form. The authoress has an apparent reliance on the indifference, darkness, and utter removal from all external knowledge and interests characterizing the farmers of her neighbourhood and their dependents, which we should be glad to believe so far well-founded as to prevent all danger of initials being recognised, and letters and conversations being traced to their authors. The book is addressed to the educated classes, and therefore this scruple is perhaps superfluous; but it is one to be read with interest and profit by all classes, except the people who are the cause of it being written.

There is a chapter devoted to 'reflections on Dissent,' from which we will quote a passage or two, as both interesting and suggestive.

'The dissenting spirit that prevails in this part of the country differs, I think, in some of its characteristics from that of the south of England.

'First, in being now the only real religion of the working classes.

'Secondly, there is hardly a trace anywhere as yet of rancour or ill-will towards those from whom they have separated.

'And thirdly, some among them seem at times to look back to the Church of their forefathers with something of regret as to a spiritual home that they have deserted.

'I think these characteristics will be best shown here by a few illustrative anecdotes; of course, multitudes more under each head might be told if necessary.

'First, as to its being now the only real religion of the working classes. To be "brought in" and "join a society" (*i.e.* a sect) are with them synonymous with the conversion of the soul to God, or with true earnestness in religion. When you are told such a one is "religious," you always find, on inquiry, that it means he has "joined a society." I have more than once heard a farmer in our parish, who regularly attends the church, and in other respects shows himself more of a Christian than the average of farmers, spoken of among his poorer neighbours as "very good for a worldly man." "Why do you call him a worldly man?" I at last inquired, and found the sole reason to be that "he never goes to chapel."

'I was talking to a young woman, lately married, who had just come into the parish, and asking her if she had been used to go to church. "Yes," she said, "from a child; father and mother always went twice on a Sunday." She also told me that father often read the Bible at home, and then added, "But they're not religious!" "Do they not pray," I asked, "as well as read the Bible at home?" "Oh yes." "And do they not try to live by the Bible?" "Yes, Ma'am, I'm sure they do." "Then what do you mean," I asked, "by saying they're not religious?" "Well, Ma'am," she answered, "they've not joined a society."

'I was talking to a lad of eighteen who was ploughing; he said, "It *was* a

[1] '*Our priest*,' the common Yorkshire word for the parish clergyman.

good spot where I was last year; master, and foreman, and three of the lads, was all Wesleyans." I said, "I am very glad to think you were among such good people; but do you think there are no good Christians who are not Wesleyans?" He considered before answering, and said thoughtfully, "I think there isn't;" adding after a pause, "there's Primitives." I said, "I know there are a great many very good Christians among both Wesleyans and Primitives; but when I talk to them I am always sorry they are Methodists." But it was such a new idea to him, he seemed only puzzled; and when he spoke of his father, for whom he seemed to have much filial reverence, and said he had been a "joined member" twenty years, I felt I was treading on delicate ground.

* * * * *

'It may seem strange that with such strong notions of the virtues of dissent, they should have, as I have said, little or no rancour against those they differ from, and yet so it is. They all think it a good thing to go to church as well as chapel, and carefully arrange the hours of their services so as not to clash with those in the church. They often say, too, that the teaching at church and chapel is just the same, though in that I think they are rather deceived.'—P. 137.

Then follows an interesting account of a class-leader, a pattern husband and father, who, overhearing her exhort a youth to come to church instead of chapel, joins in the conversation, accompanies her to church, and subsequently receives the Communion (for the first time, strange to say), without implying by this course any change in his views or practices. As there is never any shrinking from difficulties in our friend, and as she is fortunate in a very ready and clear self-possession, we find her in friendly discussion and amicable contest with all the leading Wesleyans and Primitives who come in her way, evidently an object of interest and respect to them, while she is not without hope that under wise and loving management, zeal tempered with discretion, the whole body may be brought back to the Church. One Wesleyan minister sends her his sermon by one of her pupils, which, with one exception, she seems to have found a very good one—the exception being the assumption universal in that system, that every righteous person had at one time led a wicked life. But for this, she sees no reason why he should not seek ordination from the bishop; from which we may infer that her experience possibly leads her to desire a more animated style of preaching for a rustic audience than custom sanctions in our church; though this is inferred from her reflections on the difficulty a classical education throws in the way of being understood, rather than in any direct expression of opinion; and it must be noted that she refers to her father's sermons with a confidence of their having been attended to and comprehended. The whole East Riding district, of which this lady treats, is in a wonderfully altered and improved condition since the time when its clergy were a byword—the time, no doubt, when Methodism first gained its footing. There is a

body of zealous clergy and a general movement in Church restoration,—yet are there still churches and services which force on us the question, How far are they efficient as means to an end? Near one of these often stands the chapel, passing which the resounding hymn answers for the numbers within, or the preacher's voice and the respondent amens show that attention of some sort has been gained, that no one can possibly be asleep. The preacher and his hearers evidently stand in a relation to one another. Arrived in church, it is impossible not to feel a contrast: the scanty congregation, the feeble hymn from shrill-voiced untunable school children, the service hastily performed, the sermon *not* classical, we must say, and with a twang fully equal to the Methodist preacher over the way, but sing-song, monotonous, wanting his action, and seemingly uttered without the hope of producing an impression;—a dead sleepy silence brooding over all; and it may be dust, damp, and cobweb adding a sense of desolation and decay to the sad oppressive scene. This is no fair picture of the present, it is an utter contrast to many—we trust, to most—churches and services in that part now; but it shows us what has been: it is a relic of a very common and general state of things; it accounts to our feelings and senses for the spread of Methodism, whatever other and less humiliating causes reason may suggest for the general defection, derived from the foolish preferences, the weakness, and perversity of corrupt human nature. But it is no part of this lady's aim to point out defects in our own system, and probably our extreme instances may not have come within her experience—still we find occasional hints at a want which might be supplied by more energetic action, as in her discussions.

'One whom I have always looked on as a strong dissenter, said one day, "No doubt the Church would be best if the old discipline was kept up." "What do you mean by that?" I asked. "The clergy visiting from house to house, and talking to the people, to know the state of their souls," was the reply.

'Another gave me as a reason for being a dissenter, "You see, with class meetings, and prayer meetings, and preachings, Wesleyans have so much more *means*[1] than Church people." What a reproach, thought I, to a vast number of the clergy, who say that in their small parishes there is very little to do!'

It is beyond a doubt that, whatever life can be given to our services, it is indispensable should be given. For our part, the mere difficulty of understanding in these untaught youths to which she attributes everything, seems to us possibly overstated. The fact that people cannot explain words is no proof that they do not in a dim way understand them. These boys may be only like children, who are always entirely at a loss for a definition.

[1] The usual word among the Methodists for 'means of grace.'

They may even not know the meaning of separate words, and yet arrive at a correct notion of a whole sentence. But that sentence must be uttered with a certain effect. Preachers must be able to force their way into dense minds by a vigorous diction emphatically delivered, where, if the words are new to ignorant ears, they shall explain themselves as they are spoken. This is the way children learn the meaning of words; nobody explains words to them—at least, not one in a thousand. But the power of sustaining attention without any outward act on our part belongs to cultivation—to a great class, as to children and those who are like children, mute attention for any length of time is difficult, almost to an impossibility. For our part, we should not be sorry if some change of attitude, if some subdued expression of feeling or of assent, were permissible during a sermon addressed mainly to rustic or mechanic hearers —something that should keep their attention alive, and show the preacher how far he carried them along with him. Many a man with no power of extempore preaching might, thus encouraged, be stimulated to some more pointed and searching address than was suggested to him in the stillness of his study.

In the simple congregations of native Christians in Tinnevelly, we are told that the clergy of both our Missionary Societies have found it necessary to establish this prompt response of feeling between preacher and hearer. When he gives out his text, he waits for the congregation to give it back to him in one unanimous repetition, and even the body of his discourse is often catechetical; he asks questions, he demands an audible assent to his statements. It cannot be easy to sleep in such a scene, though we can imagine not a few counteracting evils. In one of the poorer quarters of Dublin, we once witnessed a Roman Catholic congregation go down on their knees amidst sighs, and tears, and groans, while the preacher told, with much action, but in almost Scriptural wording, Elijah's miracle for the poor widow and her son. The scene was striking, though it needs to follow these impressionable people to their homes to know what good excited feeling had done them. We know that if people can sit absolutely motionless, and attend with an attention which loses not a word, this is the ideal of good listening; it is the only form of attention at which the educated classes can aim; but we also know that decorous wandering, decorous sleeping amongst the elders, and indecorous restlessness amongst the children, is the mode of reception of many a sermon, prompted by the preacher's heart, and containing words of life able to save souls if they would only make a way to them.

It is mainly the fault of the hearers in this case, who have not resisted as they ought habits of dreaminess and inattention;

but in the case of these farming lads, the model labourers of the world, we can hardly wonder if they should succumb, in their day of rest, to the atmosphere of repose, if they do sleep (though the charge is not brought against them); and perhaps leave with the impression that the Primitives are more awakening. We should like to know if the experiment was ever tried in a rustic church, of permission to express feeling and attention. It is always pleasant and rousing to see some sturdy self-possessed hearer deliberately stand up, as the only mode of shaking off his drowsiness; what we imagine, is a step further in individual action. We knew the charge would be brought that it was like a Methodist meeting; but if the meeting gets the hearers, perhaps there may be as much example as warning in the practice. Hard as it is to induce congregations to respond and to sing, when once habits of silence are broken down in any church, and a universal sound of human voices introduced in its place, that church is popular. Men feel the thrill of membership, they experience a sensation, an influence is abroad amongst them. This is an undoubted good: to any further extension of the privilege of speech, experiment might show grave objections. That preacher and hearers would be roused we may feel sure; but mere rousing, if the taste of the better sort were shocked, and due reverence were infringed upon, would be no substantial gain. If ever man or woman converts Wesleyan, Primitive, or Ranter preacher to the Church, and he have influence to bring his flock with him, we shall see the experiment tried in a natural manner.

The passages we have extracted, and the whole tone of the book, show that the writer came to this subject with no strong prejudices; a naturally candid mind brought no inherited antipathies to its consideration. She was ready to seek for, to welcome every sign of agreement and fellow-feeling. She can admire and, what is more, make our hearts warm to individual Methodists, but her conclusions against the system gather strength with experience. The book is one gradual growth of opinion against it, solely, as it seems, from witnessing its effects on the community at large and on its especial converts. Mere practical experience must always be limited, personal observation must always have a narrow range, and the very concentration of the mind before us on one subject of interest, the work of her life, enjoins caution in accepting conclusions arrived at in disappointment amid baffled hopes and various forms of trial. She is in a position we see to realize the harm, while there may be good she does not see. We may not know the full truth of the case, indeed we do not know how a woman confining herself to her own small legitimate field of action can give us this. But not

the less is the book valuable for the truth it does contain; enforced by cogent reasons, and illustrated by examples from her own immediate knowledge and observation; and we think she proves that to an ignorant population, under the very peculiar temptations which this book exposes, the system of Methodism is to the highest degree injurious—that its superstitious creed of conversion deadens the conscience, interferes with the reception of the simple truths of the Gospel, and gives a conventional meaning to religion. In a note which embodies her opinions on this point, we read—

'When we first came to B. I hardly thought of dissent as an evil; indeed, I hardly thought of it at all, or when I did, my only desire was to ignore it. Only slowly and unwillingly have I become aware of its increasing prevalence, and of its baneful influence on our working population, inducing pharisaical self-righteousness, with its attendant evils, in those who, in dissenting phrase, "make a profession," or "profess themselves religious;" this reacting on those who "make no profession," so as fearfully to increase ungodliness and irreligion, producing recklessness in many and despondency in some. Strange it is that the almost universal belief of the labouring class in the Wesleyan views of conversion should be the cause that many absolutely deny the faith of Christ; for what is it but to deny Christ when a man openly declares, as thousands do every day, that he has "no religion?" That this is, in part at least, to be laid to the door of dissent, no one could doubt who had watched its workings as closely as I have done for four years. Among those who say and think they are not religious, there are many of whom it is not wholly true; some of these are church-goers, certainly not for form sake only, but are too ignorant rightly to understand what they hear. They would only too gladly "make a profession," if they could conscientiously say they had ever felt themselves "changed" on any particular day; but they cannot, and are therefore looked on by their "converted" brethren much as the poor publican was looked on by the Pharisee; and many of the clergy, judging of the poor by the rich, and of the ignorant by the educated, preach to them more than needful on the uselessness of an empty profession of religion, little aware that this is not the lesson that a rural congregation (or the greater part of it) needs the most; and those to whom it is most applicable are generally too well satisfied with themselves to lay it much to heart.'—P. 122.

In her conversations with promising scholars who have subsequently been 'brought in,' are many curious instances of the readiness with which the mind falls into the one requirement of the system and of all anti-sacramental systems—that is, naming the day and hour of conversion. The bold and seemingly genuine and conscientious assertions on this point which characterize so much religious biography receive a useful illustration from the facts of this history. We are not doubting sudden conversions as such, but we constantly suspect the truth of particular instances as being influenced by anxiety to prove a desired point, and by a sort of false humility willing to depreciate *past* self in favour of *present* self. Men's memories often play them strange tricks. In such cases, lookers-on are better judges than

the man's self, whose word is received as beyond appeal. This is proved satisfactorily by such instances as the following:—

'One day this year I was speaking for the first time with a young ploughman, whose countenance and manner bore the impress of truth and earnestness, and that sort of forgetfulness of self that always consists with worldliness and singleness of heart or reality.

'I was much struck by the things he said, and his way of saying them. It was evident that he had thought much on the things of God, and had a strong abiding sense of his continual presence; nay more, that he accepted the scheme of redemption with simple unquestioning faith, and that his thoughts had dwelt much on the subject.

'When I saw him again some time after, his first words filled me with astonishment. He told me that when I had seen him before, he had had no religion, but that he had been converted since then at a camp-meeting; and he actually believed it was so. It was true enough he was "changed." I could not help perceiving a change in him; he had grown self-conscious, and I fear there were already the beginnings of spiritual pride, that without the special grace of God was more likely to increase than to diminish.'

She reminds another, who had told her he had been converted six weeks before, of a gradual change which she had herself witnessed, and indeed had been instrumental in. She is so used to this language and tone that it has evidently lost its power over her, and she can dispute and disprove what a youth assumes to have been facts known to himself only, in a way that must perplex if it does not convince him against his will; for it is an article of faith very important to the comfort and spiritual credit of the holder, which he will naturally cling to—as we may judge from the following instance of the imperative demand for precise time and place, before a religious profession can be made:—

'I will give another instance that shows the notions of conversion current among Wesleyans in a very strange light. A farmer's daughter had a friend some years older than herself, who was a sincere Churchwoman, and the girl had always told her friend that she intended to remain the same, and should never "join a society," though nearly all her relations were Wesleyans. However, one day, as her friend afterwards told me, she had allowed herself to be placed "on the penitent bench," at chapel, was brought in, and joined.

'After this she seemed unhappy and vexed with herself, and said she felt she had done wrong, and wished she had not done it. "And why did you?" asked her friend. She answered that it was because her friends were always asking her to tell them when she had been converted, and she could not remember any particular time when she had been all at once changed; so they would not believe that she was a Christian, or had any religion, and she could not bear it.'

An instructive instance of the force of public opinion! We cannot wonder at the effect these views have upon education. Her experience is, that Wesleyan parents go from one chapel service to another, from one camp-meeting to another, and leave their children at the best to the teaching of their Sunday school:—

'But it is not to be looked for that *they* should strive to cherish the grace

given, who do not believe that it ever has been given, and who think that the conversion needful for all comes to but few in childhood; for if they reason about it, they cannot but think it in vain to attempt to instil religion into their children; and many Dissenters do so reason, and always will; and I believe this to be the cause that so many of their children grow up reprobates. I have heard more than one Wesleyan say (indeed, I believe it is a common saying with them) that the children of religious parents grow up no better than other children—nay, I believe they might say with truth that they grow up worse than others, if the religion of the parents is of the sort that teaches that every Christian child is a child of the devil till he has been converted on some particular day. Can this dismal creed be the religion of Him who took the little children in His arms, and laid His hands on them and blessed them?'

And to one who is taking to bad ways, she writes:—

'You were brought up with very different notions from what I was. I was taught that, because I was a Christian and a child of God, I was bound to love God and live to Him. The Ranters and Wesleyans teach people that, till they get converted at some chapel or camp-meeting, they are children of the devil.'

In all fields of labour where the worker comes to close quarters with the individuals to be benefited, there must be disappointment and there must be controversy. Men cannot be indifferent to opinions which thwart all their efforts and neutralise their hopes. While people theorise, and while they do not test their theories too severely—that is, while they have ample space, and are in no danger of being brought to book by too close a scrutiny of results—there may be unbounded toleration, and there may be unvarying exultant hope. Such books as the 'Missing Link' illustrate this order of well-doing. It is a grand jubilant report of other persons' successful efforts. We are shown a brilliant career in a new field. Only keep clear of Popery and Tractarianism (nobody is absolutely without prejudices), and hire Bible women of the lower class, irrespective of sect and minor distinctions, and it would seem the secret of social regeneration is discovered. Let us borrow a page from this sanguine publication, in contrast with the sober and not seldom depressing pages we have been called to think over:—

'It is visitation in their homes, and by those whom they will permit to enter, which is needed by the London poor. The clergyman himself is thought by a large class too good and grand: the visits of the Scripture reader and City missionary are objected to by many of the husbands in their own absence. Of the lady visitor they will beg, and think she has no right to come to them except she brings relief; and they say, besides, that she is seldom punctual. But for the quiet, civil woman of their own class, who heeds their difficulties, and is surprised at nothing, for her they have evidently a very different welcome. Now it is teaching the mothers in those homes—*the mothers who will not come out to learn*—the common acts of domestic life, of which their deficient education, and their early thriftless marriages, have left them totally ignorant, that is THE CRYING WANT OF THE TIME; and this is woman's work. It should be the work, under right direction, of WOMEN OF

THEIR OWN DEGREE, who must be MODERATELY PAID AND CAREFULLY SUPERINTENDED AGENTS; and it is this beginning at the ROOTS of society that would do away with *need* of half our Reformatories, Refuges, Ragged Schools, and double the efficiency of all the rest.

'That such a range of efforts should be intimately associated with, and should indeed spring out of, the OFFER OF THE BOOK OF GOD, is especially necessary. This must be the VISIBLE MARK OF ITS DISTINCTION from Romanist and Tractarian operations. The Church "which hides the Book" has no more subtle and extended power over its members than is gained by its system of female charitable visitation. That Church can find the women; that Church lacks not the means to employ them; and shall the Protestant strength of Christendom consider the same duties impossible?

'If there is one desire nearer to the heart of those who are at present aiming to extend this agency than another, it is that the work shall be wide in its basis, and that UNION, PRAYER, and FAITH shall be its foundation stones. "Union in which sects shall scarcely be named in the choice of the workers; prayer that takes no denial;" and we have hitherto found none, whether as regards instruments or the funds to supply their need.'—*The Missing Link*, p. 174.

We do not think that this strain could be maintained by any one who himself or herself visited the same locality for four years—the range of 'Ploughing and Sowing.' Difficulties and opposing influences would modify expectation, would infuse misgiving, would produce an abundant crop of disappointment, and would besides bring proofs that religious differences, called minor when first viewed, in the working do interfere with united action. When people are absolutely brought face to face with evil, when they feel themselves as it were contending against it in a tangible form, the tone is sobered at once. The state of the East Riding agricultural districts, bad as it is, cannot equal the worst purlieus of London, but our authoress has sorrowfully to record in her concluding pages that it is such as to make lapse and backsliding things to be grieved over rather than wondered at, and that the customs of farmhouse life are of a nature to put a stumbling-block in the way of individual purity and holiness of life, such as only Divine grace can render powerless for harm.

'TO A CLERGYMAN.

'I hardly know how to write a letter that you will be quite unprepared for. I have had for some weeks past fears and misgivings about R. R., that are now but too fully confirmed by his own confessions. This, though the most grievous of all, is but one instance among many of those of whom I have hoped the most, and believed the best, utterly belying my good opinion. . . . Their life is one of such great temptation, with so little means of spiritual culture or spiritual nourishment of any kind, that the result is more sad than strange. For eight months in the year precluded even from going to church—often not allowed a candle in the kitchen by which those who can read might read their Bibles in an evening; and prayer seemingly impossible in the room where they are herded together at night, and cursing and swearing and profane jesting of every sort heard on all sides. How little is this state of things generally understood!—and it is from such as these we are to select candidates for Confirmation.'

Now this R. R., but for the eye kept upon him, would have formed a signal instance of good done; nor are we still left without hope of his repentance and return. The labour bestowed on him and many like him has not, we trust, been in vain, though it does not make the show a shorter or less intimate knowledge of circumstances would have justified.

Often, after a secession to Methodist ranks and a course of religious excitement, there follows a fall. The converts relapse into drinking and swearing, and are denounced by their new friends as 'broke,' as 'having given up religion,' in which state their first teacher seeks them out, and wins them by warning, entreaty, and every form of persuasion, till they show some sign of repentance.

We talk of disappointment and seeming failure, but the story is not without marked and signal encouragements. The following letter from a Scripture Reader to the garrison at Chatham, concerning one of her pupils, she records as matter for thankfulness, and as a welcome refreshment in the midst of many disappointments.

'May, 1860.

'Madam,—I received your letter, and was glad to find my account of James had been such a comfort to you. I see from your last letter to him that you in some measure know the position of a soldier. I have felt it my duty to give you a few more particulars.

'I ought to have mentioned in my last that, on Easter Sunday, James, and myself, and another soldier, J.'s companion, attended the Holy Communion. It has been my privilege to labour in the garrison now nearly four years, and never do I remember meeting with a soldier more attentive to the means of grace, and one who required less looking after. He comes up at least three or four times a-week to our Bible readings.

'Yesterday evening, returning with him from a Bible reading, I said, "How do you get on now with your companions in the barrack-room?"

'"They don't meddle with me now as they did at first."

'"What do they say when you kneel down before them night and morning?"

'"They used to laugh at me at first, and tell me I should not be able to carry on that rig in a barrack-room; but I didn't mind them, and they don't much molest me now."

'Therefore, Madam, I would say, don't be discouraged; your work of love will not be in vain; and should you never be permitted to see another instance of good resulting from your labours, wait and persevere in humble faith and prayer. God has promised, and that is enough. Your labour shall not be in vain in the Lord. You may be doing good to those around you, and yet not know it for many years. I must say I have found it so.—I remain, Madam,

'Your humble servant, 'J. I.'—*Ploughing and Sowing*, p. 225.

The reception here noted of Holy Communion gives us the secret of constancy. We have always observed that with the poor Communion is the test of membership; to be a member of the Church is with them, as it is in truth, being a communicant. It is the turning point in the instances before us, whether they receive the Communion or join the Primitives, who seem

strangely inobservant of this rite. 'If only we could get some to attend the sacrament!' she writes. 'I am trying now; but, oh! the difficulty!'—and many pages are devoted to plain Scriptural arguments, and earnest pleadings on this point. To one of her numerous clerical helpers and encouragers she writes:—

'I am especially grateful for the part of your letter in which you speak of the Holy Communion as the bond of Christian fellowship.

'If we could induce all to join in that, I do indeed think differences would soon melt away; but that is the grand difficulty; and that so very few of those "who profess themselves religious" are communicants is, I think, one of the saddest proofs of how much dissent has destroyed Christian unity, if it has not obscured Christian truth.

'I suppose dissent will be a perennial trouble here. May I only each year see more clearly the way to deal with it, and be enabled to assist in ever so small a degree in overcoming the evil.

'To overcome evil with good is what in this case one would most especially wish to do. The leading Dissenters in our parish are really good and truly Christian men, and think they do all that we could ask or look for, by going to church as well as chapel.'

This neglect in the 'religious' of so obvious a duty and privilege may arise, in this particular instance, from the feeling of disunion with the Church, existing without the profession of disunion—that, in fact, they do not feel themselves at home in the more solemn Church services. But, of course, it is a part of the working of Dissent to undervalue appointed and enjoined religious privileges in favour of self-elected ones.

But our article has run to a length which takes us by surprise. Many points of the book we have left untouched. There are scenes of cottage life and traits of manners which come in with excellent effect, and constitute it very amusing reading, though we half apologise for being diverted where the writer is in such profound earnest, and is influenced solely by a deep sense of responsibility—that engine which is said to lay its weight so heavily on women. It is, indeed, a very serious book on a very weighty topic. We have said before, that, as an example of work for women, it can only be taken for general imitation. All that this lady has done has come naturally in her way to do; that is, being deeply impressed by the state of things in which she lives, in which her lot is providentially cast, she has not put aside her first impulses, but has followed them out simply and step by step, so that, exceptional as the work is, it is natural to her. It is only women similarly circumstanced who can expect to prosper and be useful in such a field. How few are physically or mentally constituted for such a mission! How few would be permitted to set it on foot with so little hindrance as is here recorded! The one striking value of her work is that it rescues the class of ploughboys from the limbo of hopeless indifference

and aversion in which too many hold them, comforting themselves in the persuasion that the hapless clowns are out of reach of ordinary humanizing influences. They have been here found open and impressible to kindness, and, in the full sense, teachable. In spite of all the sins of these poor lads, we leave off with a liking and regard for them; they are capable of inspiring and returning Christian tenderness and love; they have a strong sense of gratitude and even chivalrous affection for the lady who gives up time, thought, and ease in their cause. There is stuff in them to make good, generous, honest, religious men; and we doubt not that, if our unknown friend is spared to witness the issue of her toil, she will see and rejoice in many fair fruits of her zealous, and persevering, and faithful service. In the rush of promiscuous advice, suggestion, and effort, which the vast unsatisfied demands of our population are continually creating in our age of active and ambitious benevolence, this work of a sincere, consistent, and devoted daughter of our own Church, carried on under its auspices and in its service, has seemed to us to call for especial notice and sympathy.

ART. VI.— *The Treasury of Scripture-Knowledge.* London: Bagster.

THE following remarks have little claim to novelty, in so far as regards their substance. The peculiarity of their form arises from the circumstance, that they have been suggested by the perusal of the concluding essay in the volume entitled 'Essays and Reviews;' that, namely, by Professor Jowett, on the Interpretation of Scripture. The present writer's object is not to re-state all those characteristics of the Bible which distinguish it from other books—a task which would demand a volume, and might be the labour of a lifetime—but simply to touch upon those which appear to be more or less impugned in the remarkable tractate just referred to.

Such an announcement may expose us to the charges of presumption and uncharitableness; of presumption, inasmuch as it seems to single out the essayist, who of all the seven bears, perhaps, the highest reputation for ability, earnestness, and self-sacrifice; of uncharitableness, because Professor Jowett has already been attacked, in common with his fellow-workers, in the pages of this Review. The apparent presumption may be again alluded to before we close. Of want of charity we can only say, that we trust it may be possible so to write as to prove, to fair judges, that what is said arises out of no spirit of mere personal opposition. In the words of Mr. Jowett's distinguished friend and apologist, Canon Stanley: 'How clear is 'the field, how light the task, even of controversy against others, 'if we feel and can make them feel that our object is not to 'blast their character, or to make capital out of our attacks upon 'them, but simply to set forth what is true.' The selection of one particular writer by the reviewer has its origin in this sole cause; that his own line of study, however humble and limited, has, in some measure, come across the path of the seventh essayist, and has not, in any commensurate degree, been directed along the track of the preceding six.

It is not possible that such a mind as Mr. Jowett's should produce a hundred pages, upon such a thesis as the Interpretation of Scripture, without saying much that is true, much that is beautiful. It would be easy to transfer to our pages entire sentences and paragraphs with which we can either wholly or in part agree; though that agreement might not extend to the modification which, in some cases, appears to be effected by the context. Such, for example, *inter alia*, are the following:

—'The purer the light in the human heart, the more it will 'have an expression of itself in the mind of Christ; the greater 'the knowledge of the development of man, the truer will be 'the insight gained into the "increasing purpose" of revelation. 'In which, also, the individual soul has a practical part, finding 'a sympathy with its own imperfect feelings; in the broken 'utterance of the Psalmist, or the Prophet, as well as in the 'fulness of Christ.' (P. 375.) Or, again:—'There are notes 'struck in places [of Scripture], which, like some discoveries of 'science, have sounded before their time; and only after many 'days, have been caught up, and found a response on the 'earth. There are germs of truth which, after thousands of 'years, have never yet taken root in the world. There are 'lessons in the Prophets which, however simple, mankind have 'not yet learned even in theory, and which the complexity of 'society rather tends to hide; aspects of human life in Job 'and Ecclesiastes, which have a truth of desolation about them, 'which we faintly realize in ordinary circumstances. It is, 'perhaps, the greatest difficulty of all to enter into the mean- 'ing of the words of Christ—so gentle, so human, so divine— 'neither adding to them, nor marring their simplicity. It is one 'of the highest tasks on which the labour of a life can be spent, 'to bring the words of Christ a little nearer the heart of man.' (P. 380.) The remarks in p. 363, on what have often been termed 'counsels of perfection,' though far from novel in themselves, are delivered with much spirit and freshness; and widely as we differ from the tone and teaching of the Essay, as a whole—perilous to the faith of Christians, as we believe it to be—we cannot refuse to recognise in it, as well as in the author's former volumes, the presence of gifts that we would earnestly covet, more especially that great and hallowed one of the Gospel, the gift of purity of heart. Need we add, that such excellences do not render the opinions inculcated the less dangerous. Pelagianism is not the less a deadly error because S. Augustine could describe his great opponent as *vir acutissimus . . . circumspectus . . . tam egregiè Christianus*, and his friends as being *castâ vitâ, moribusque laudabiles.*[1]

We propose, in the following pages, to consider the Bible in the following points of view:—I. As the only original book, consisting of a collection of connected writings of varied dates and authorship, and treating of the supernatural, which is revered by many millions of men as the main source of their spiritual life, and, as an authoritative revelation from the Most

[1] De Peccat. Meritis et Remissione. (Tom. x. pp. 73, 74. Ed. Ben.)

High. II. As a book containing prophecies and types. III. As a book whose words in many cases admit of a meaning beyond that literal one which the writer intended. IV. As a book which treats of human nature as a fallen nature. V. As a book which teaches the mystery of the Holy Incarnation. VI. As a book which gives a peculiar and unique idea of itself.

The narrow and imperfect character of this list must be obvious at a single glance. Its features, however, are impressed upon it by the Essay to which our remarks are mainly referrible. Thus, for instance, the questions connected with miracles are not less important than those connected with prophecy, but they do not occupy an equally prominent place in the pages of Professor Jowett. The true doctrine of the Holy Trinity is as Scriptural, and as essential to a sound faith, as the true doctrine of the Incarnation; but it is the latter rather than the former which seems to us to be endangered by the reasonings referred to. We simply, then, follow whither we are led, and not elsewhere.

I. The meaning of our first characteristic (or, if the reader prefers it, cluster of characteristics) may be made clearer by illustration. Thus, for example, Æschylus and Dante are both writers who deal very largely, according to their widely different measures, with the supernatural. But no man living regards any sentence of their writings as binding upon his conscience, and what they tell concerning the unseen is in no case accepted unless confirmed by some external authority. The Zendavesta may surpass all other ancient writings but those of the Old Testament in the vigour of its claim to be a divine revelation;[1] but its day has long since vanished, and its influence, most lofty and beneficial up to a certain point, is now confined at most to the merest remnant of the Ghebers. The Vedas have been revered as the Scriptures in Hindostan: but the Gods of the Vedas have for many centuries been obsolete, and 'the great 'body of the present religious practices of the Hindoos are sub-'sequent in time and foreign in tenor to those that were en-'joined by the authorities which they profess to regard as the 'foundations of their system.'[2] Scarcely one Brahmin in a hundred is now able to read the Rigveda.[3]

The Koran, indeed, stands upon somewhat different grounds. Some years have passed since we quoted with approbation, in this Review, the words of one of its greatest admirers, who

[1] Döllinger, Heidenthum und Judenthum, p. 352. Cf. Hengstenberg, Preface to *Christology of the Old Testament.*

[2] The late Professor H. H. Wilson, cit. ap. Mrs. Speir's *Life in Ancient India*, p. 371.

[3] Professor Max Müller, in *Oxford Essays* for 1856, p. 22.

speaks of it as exhibiting 'a very original piety, a moving devo-'tion, a thoroughly individual religious poetry, which cannot 'possibly be forced or artificial.'[1] But though millions foster from this work their moral and spiritual life, it is not a collection; it is the production of one author only, and it cannot be in strictness called original. 'Without Moses and the Prophets, 'and Christ,' says the writer just quoted, 'Mohammed is incon-'ceivable, since the essential substance of the Koran is derived 'from the Old and New Testaments.' The Koran recognises as true prophets Adam, Noah, Abraham, Moses, and Jesus; it tells of the angels Gabriel and Michael, of the fallen angels and their prince Eblis, of a final judgment, of heaven and of hell. 'The fall of Eblis, and the fall of Adam; the flood of Noah, 'and the life of Abraham; Sodom and Gomorrah; Isaac and 'Jacob; the guilt of Pharaoh and the plagues of Egypt; the 'rod of Aaron, the acts of Moses, the golden calf, the manna 'and the quails; Samuel and Saul; David and Goliath; Job, 'Jonah, and Solomon;—all these find their place in its pages, 'though sometimes in a very distorted guise.'[2]

How does all this bear, it may be asked, upon the essay of Professor Jowett? It bears, we reply, upon his very first pages and sentences. A book marked by the cluster of characteristics here set forth must almost of necessity involve difficulties, must almost of necessity excite differences. Writings on that which is supernatural are likely to be harder to understand than those which only concern that which is natural. A collection of writings of various authors is usually harder than a work which is the production of a single mind. And if the meaning of words is allowed to interpenetrate the moral and spiritual life of millions—if numbers have for centuries looked beyond the text, in the belief that a personal mind has guided certain writers, and given their language a significance beyond that which they intended—then the very circumstance of so much being at stake will add, indeed, to the keenness of inquiry, but will almost infallibly introduce new elements of dissension.

And when, therefore, Mr. Jowett announces, in the very first words of his essay, that 'it is a strange, though familiar fact, 'that great differences of opinion exist respecting the interpre-'tation of Scripture,' we agree with him in regarding the fact as a familiar one, but are surprised that he, or any one else, should consider it strange.

---

[1] Möhler. Ueber das Verhältniss des Islams zum Evangelium, p. 370. (Ed. Döllinger.)

[2] Encyclopædia Britannica (8th edit.), art. Mohammedanism (by Rev. J. G. Cazenove).

We have just been alluding to certain works in contrast with the Bible. The mere mention of contrast implies some points of similarity; for we do not compare things that are totally different from each other. Now, it is really, we think, deserving of remark, that, in so far as the works in question do in anywise resemble Holy Scripture, in so far a similar set of difficulties is apt to arise concerning them. Our readers will, we trust, excuse a little amplification on this head.

Dante treats largely of the supernatural. Now, those portions of the 'Divina Commedia' which are the least interwoven with the events and interests of his time, and range within the ethereal courts, are precisely those which are the most difficult to understand. The 'Paradiso,' as a whole, is decidedly the hardest of the three divisions. And do his interpreters agree together? Is it not, on the contrary, notorious that there may almost be said to be opposite schools of criticism concerning him? Does the apparent introduction of the celebrated Countess Matilda in the twenty-eighth canto of the 'Purgatorio' mean more than meets the ear? Beatrice herself—how far is she the departed lady of the house of Portinari, whom Dante knew in youth; how far a personification of the queen of sciences, theology? One of the most anti-allegorizing and matter-of-fact critics of the poem, the eminent French *litterateur*, M. Fauriel, speaks as follows of the two opening scenes of the poet's alarm at the three wild beasts, and of his rescue by the three beatified spirits:—'The first of these two scenes is evidently allegoric, 'both as a whole, and in its details. It is not reasonably 'possible to understand literally that horrible forest where 'Dante has lost his way—that smiling ascent by which he seeks 'to escape, or those three beasts that bar his passage; all this 'is evidently symbolical; all this has been interpreted in as 'many various senses as Dante has had commentators, transla-'tors, or admirers. I have myself put forward one interpreta-'tion, which, of course, seemed to me more plausible than any 'of the others, but which, at the same time, I did not go so far 'as to say was the true one. All goes to prove that Dante died 'the sole possessor of the secret of this allegory. . . . .

'Is this second scene allegorical, like the first, to which it 'belongs? Are these three ladies who concert and agree to come 'to Dante's assistance in his distress, symbols, also, like the wild 'beasts? Are they ideas, or fictions personified? Is Beatrice 'theology, or philosophy, or some other of the sciences culti-'vated by Dante, and not Beatrice, daughter of Folco Portinari, 'wife of a Florentine of the house of the Bardi, who died at Flo-'rence in 1290? I am aware that almost all commentators have 'interpreted this second scene allegorically as well as the first;

'but I have examined their interpretations; I have carefully 'compared them with Dante's own words; and the more I reflect 'on them the more I felt they were inadmissible. So strong is 'my opinion, and my conviction on this point, that even were it 'historically proved that Dante wished to treat this part of his 'poem allegorically, and to represent theology under the form 'of Beatrice, I should admit the intention without being able to 'believe in its accomplishment: I should persist in maintaining 'that such as it is represented in the passage we are speaking of, 'the figure of Beatrice is incapable of an allegorical interpreta-'tion.'[1] Now we are perfectly well aware of the strong repugnance to the latter part of this criticism which will be felt by many admirers of the great Florentine. Be it so; we have not the slightest wish to commit either ourselves or our readers to the views of M. Fauriel. All that we ask is, if men of sense and of high ability can differ so widely upon the meaning of a single canto of a most deeply-studied poet, is it so very wonderful that they should differ on the interpretation of the Bible?

Now, if we were to commence an essay upon Dante with the words—'It is a strange but familiar fact, that great differences 'of opinion exist respecting the interpretation of the *Divina* '*Commedia*,' most Italian scholars would, we are convinced, be prepared with abundance of cogent reasons why the familiar fact should not be considered strange. And yet the great poem of Dante is but the work of a single man, and its interpretation can only very indirectly affect our consciences. Few grounds for dissension over its meaning can be assigned which are not applicable, with tenfold force, to the words of Holy Scripture.

We turn to Æschylus. What are the warnings of his latest English editor, the accomplished scholar selected by the conductors of the 'Bibliotheca Classica'? 'He is difficult, because he is 'profound; or, in other words, because he treats of matters beyond 'the reach of man's ordinary knowledge and perceptions. . . . . 'He is fond of dwelling upon the principles of divine action in 'relation to man; but he rarely expresses his sentiments on these 'subjects in plain and ordinary language, but employs terms 'mystical, figurative, and sometimes grammatically obscure. He 'has a system before him, uniform, connected, and consistent; 'but he gives us mere glimpses of it here and there, which, with-'out the additional light of other passages, would hardly guide 'us through the intricacies of the subject. His mind was per-'vaded by a gloomy awe of invisible and supernatural agencies 'for evil, especially those of the Earth and the demon powers of

[1] Dante, &c. Par M. Fauriel (Paris, 1854), tome i. p. 453, *et seq.* Fraticelli, a recent editor of Dante's *Vita Nuova*, gives specimens of the most opposite school.

'Hades. Hence, there is a continual reference to the ideas of 'expiation, propitiation, and averting of possible ills. . . . Though 'here and there, perhaps, doubts occur as to the right reading of 'words, we cannot help feeling that the views of the author as 'to the attributes of the Divine Mind are the real difficulties 'which we have to encounter, and which lie beyond the province 'of the mere critic or grammarian. . . . In such passages as these '[Agam. 172-4; 365-70; Choeph. 628-39]—and they are very 'numerous—there is, literally, scarcely a word that does not 'involve a doctrine, a metaphor, or a meaning, that lies below 'the surface. . . . The supernatural was his delight. And he 'treats these subjects with the earnestness of a poet who had a 'firm belief in their reality, and in their playing an important 'part in human affairs.'[1]

There is much of this fine and, as it seems to us, most just piece of criticism, which it would be alike irreverent and untrue to apply to the sacred penmen. But there is much also which, with slight modification, might be so applied. And thus much can be urged as regards the difficulties of another solitary genius. Is it, after all, the *fact*, mentioned by Mr. Jowett, that is strange? Or, rather, does not the strangeness lie in the circumstance that any one should think it strange?

The Zendavesta, as has been remarked, has, for many centuries, ceased to influence any considerable portion of the human family. But, so long as its influence lasted, there was no lack of dissension respecting it. How far Zoroaster was its author, or, as the best authorities now hold, only a compiler; whether he was to be regarded as only a prophet, or as a mediator between Ormuzd and mankind, and even (as in time was held by some) the ruler of this lower world, were all subjects of keen debate. 'The obsolete and mysterious language,' says Gibbon, 'in which the Zendavesta was composed, opened a field 'of dispute to seventy sects, who variously explained the funda-'mental doctrines of their religion.' At the date referred to by Gibbon (about A.D. 240), the Emperor Artaxerxes had these points settled by a council of Magi, and all but exterminated with the sword those who, on any ground, dissented from the decisions arrived at.[2]

Mr. Jowett says (p. 335), that 'even the Vedas and the Zenda-'vesta, though beset by obscurities of language probably greater 'than are found in any portion of the Bible, are interpreted, 'at least by European scholars, according to fixed rules, and 'beginning to be closely understood.' When the books of the Bible have as little sway over the hearts and consciences of

[1] Æschyli Tragœdiæ. Ed. Paley (Preface), London, 1855.
[2] Gibbon, vol. i. chap. 8. (Cf. Neander, vol. ii. p. 168, ed. Bohn.)

men as the Vedas and the Zendavesta at present possess, and when a race of scholars can be found as much exalted above Christian Europeans, as Europeans are above heathen Orientals, then—but not till then—will such remarks have some slight force. But the parallel would even then completely fail in a point of unspeakable importance. That it should hold good we must assume that the keys that unlock the difficulties are, in each case, identical. Mastery of Zend and of Sanscrit are the paramount means of access to the doctrines of the ancient quasi-scriptures of the Parsee and the Hindoo. But it is a general belief among Christians that, to understand the Word of God, there is requisite not a mere knowledge of Greek and Hebrew, but faith, and humility, and prayer, for the guidance of the Holy Spirit.

This aspect of the case appears to us sufficiently important to warrant a slight digression.

Among the many indirect blessings of Christianity must be reckoned a marvellous quickening and enlargement of the human intellect. In no department of knowledge is this more conspicuous than in the survey of the spiritual condition of nations external to Christendom. A philosophic view of the Persian religion by a Greek, of the Jewish by a Roman, of the Christian by a Buddhist or a Mahometan, is not merely a nonentity, but it is likewise scarcely conceivable. Nor is it a valid reply to remark that some eminent men among the living and the dead, who have engaged in such inquiries, cannot be considered to be believers in Christianity; for the enlargement of which we speak is not confined to those who receive the promises of Christ to their soul's health. That sun rises on the evil and the good; that rain descends on the just and on the unjust. The unbeliever, who scoffs at the faith of the Cross, is indebted to it, as for a thousand other temporal blessings; so also to much of his intellectual power, much of his intellectual enjoyment. Celsus, and Julian, and Voltaire, are, in some sense, an offspring of its begetting; inasmuch as they would not have become what they did in heathen climes or ages. They influence, and are influenced by, those whom they oppose. They bring out defenders of Christianity, who are compelled to view its truths in a new light; to become doctors, where they would have been well content to rest as simple believers. But the impugners of the faith in turn adopt, half-unconsciously, numberless ideas, and set up a standard of judgment, which would never have entered into their minds but for that Gospel which they affect to despise. They too, if they sit in judgment on books esteemed sacred, beyond the limits of Christendom, are constantly found to be judging with a silent reference to the mind of Christendom. Voltaire,

for example, in his harsh and most uncharitable estimate of Mahomet, is inspired, mainly indeed by his hatred of all who are in anywise earnest about religion of any sort; but partly also, because, in his gross ignorance of Arabian customs, he condemns whatever would have been condemned at Paris in the eighteenth century. But in truth, the great majority of such investigations have been originated and fostered by Christians. Such a survey as that, for example, with which Neander opens his 'Church History' (to take one specimen out of many) is a thing undreamt of beyond Christendom. No Moslem ever spent forty years over the New Testament, as Maracci did over the Koran, in order to furnish means for its refutation. The standards of the false religions are alternately so narrow or so vague, that their adherents have not wherewithal to measure the fulness of Christianity, nor the definiteness of its leading dogmas. It was the remark of a Chinese convert, that Europeans can form no idea of the utter deficiency of that true critical spirit which the Christian faith alone supplies, in countries where the Gospel is unknown. Only with that aid, he adds, only from that just point of view, with that bright enlightenment, can the real treasures of the ancient books revered by the Chinese, the Schu-King, &c., be perceived.[1] And when, then, Professor Jowett inserts the limiting clause, 'at least by European scholars,' into his declaration of the clearness of interpretation beginning to be attached to ancient Oriental books, he does what is indeed wise and most necessary, as without such limitation the entire sentence would be utterly untrue. But at the same time, its presence, we must maintain, renders the inference which is sought to be drawn thence null and void. If 'European scholars' are so successful, their success arises not only from the growth of sound criticism and philology, but likewise from the circumstance of Christianity affording them (despite all the dissensions among Christians themselves) a lofty resting-place, whence they may really obtain that calm and serene view of the other regions which was falsely vaunted by the Epicurean poet of old.

Ad propositum revertamur. Let us continue our brief and hurried survey of these books in the only way in which an approximation to fairness can be obtained, and that is by regarding them as in the hands of those to whom they are, or were once, as a living authority.

The books which the Hindoos esteemed sacred—were there no differences of opinion respecting their authority and interpretation? Let those who doubt upon the reply to be made to this query turn to that invaluable work of Professor Max Müller

[1] Windischmann. Die Philosophie im Fortgang der Weltgeschichte. (Bonn, 1827.) Erster Theil. Pp. 54, 5.

which bears upon the subject.[1] Therein he may read of the Sruti, which are held to be revealed, and the Sûtras based upon them, but avowedly attributed to human authors; a distinction which has exercised 'a great influence on the religious struggles in India.' Or again, how local varieties of accent and pronunciation crept in, were sanctioned by the traditions of different families or schools, and could not be given up, because there was no way of determining the proper mode, and yet an improper mode was held in some cases to change the meaning. Or again, how difficulties have arisen, not wholly unlike those which divide Christians respecting the Apocrypha. 'No ortho-'dox Brahmin would for a moment admit that Brâhmanas and 'Sûtras belonged to the same class of literature. They fear the 'danger of such an admission, because, as Kumarila says, "If 'the name of Sruti were once granted to the Sûtras, it would 'with difficulty be denied to the sacred writings of Buddhists, 'and other heretics." It would be, as he expresses himself 'in his graphic language, "like letting in the heretics on the 'high road, after having driven them out of the village with 'sticks and fists." ' Or once more, to show that the Bible does not stand alone in the particular feature which appears so strange to Professor Jowett, let us place his four opening sentences, precisely as they stand, side by side with M. Müller's remarks on the only portion of the Vedas that lives and energizes.

Professor Max Müller on the Vedas.

'The philosophical chapters, well known under the name of Upanishads, are almost the only portion of Vedic literature which is extensively read to this day. They contain, or are supposed to contain, the highest authority on which the various systems of philosophy in India rest. Not only the Vedânta philosopher, who by his very name professes his faith in the ends and objects of the Veda, but the Sânkhya, the Vaiseshika, the Nyâya, and Yoga philosophers, all pretend to find in the Upanishads some warranty for their tenets, however antagonistic in their bearing. The same applies to the numerous sects that have existed, and still exist, in India. Their founders, if they have any pretensions to orthodoxy, invariably appeal to some passage in the Upanishads in order to substantiate their own reasonings.'—*Ancient Sanskrit Literature*, p. 316.

Professor Jowett on the Interpretation of Scripture.

'It is a strange, though familiar fact, that great differences of opinion exist respecting the interpretation of Scripture. All Christians receive the Old and New Testament as sacred writings, but they are not agreed about the meaning which they attribute to them. The book itself remains as at the first: the commentators seem rather to reflect the changing atmosphere of the world or of the Church. Different individuals or bodies of Christians have a different point of view to which their interpretation is narrowed or made to conform.'

[1] History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature. London: Williams and Norgate (Second Edition). Our references are to pages 75, 76, 117, 171, 2.

We must all know how, between Arian and Athanasian, Calvinist and Arminian, Protestant and Catholic, a different reading in a single verse of Scripture may be held to affect thought and practice. Let it not be forgotten that, on the strength of a single false reading in the Rigveda, thousands of lives have been sacrificed, and a fanatical rebellion threatened. The humane, and ultimately successful, endeavour of the English Government to stop the practice of widow-burning in India, was resisted on the authority of the corrupt change of the word *agre* (altar) into *agneh* (fire).[1]

The Koran, as has already been remarked, though less original, is far more influential than any of the above-named works. It is the production of a single mind, and that in many respects a very bounded and limited one. Yet the Moslem doctors (as even the latitudinarian M. Renan[2] remarks) recognise no less than 225 contradictions in the Koran; that is to say, 225 passages which were abrogated by its author as a consequence of some change in policy.

And simple as is the Koran in respect of structure, when compared with the complex framework of Holy Scripture, it is truly wonderful to witness the amount of difference of interpretation to which it has been subjected by those who accept it as divine. Despite the apparent simplicity of its teaching respecting the Godhead, and the absence of anything sacramental, or in anywise mysterious, even the divisions of Christendom have been less numerous (in proportion to time and numbers), and less violent than those of Islamism; although Spinoza, with an ignorance surpassing his ill-will, dared to point to the followers of Mahomet as an exemplification of perfect unity. Are the Sonnites or the Shiites the truer representatives of the doctrine of the Koran? We believe that the Sonnites are; but the Shiites are to this day numerous, powerful, and so strongly possessed by their own views, that Lieutenant Burton[3] saw them weeping at the peril of their lives over the tombs of Ali and Fatima, and anathematising the memory of those whom they regard as the intruding Caliphs. Is the fatalism of the Koran meant to apply to all the affairs of life, or only to the spiritual ones? The Ulemas, the recognised authorities, say the latter; but they do not succeed in imparting this view to the mass of their co-religionists. Is it fair, with one of their infinitely numerous sects, the Dhaharites, to interpret the Koran literally, rejecting every allegorical and mystic sense, or with another sect, the Batenites, to press the latter almost exclusively? How far were those fierce and ardent Puritans of Islam, the

[1] Prof. Max Müller in *Oxford Essays* for 1856. (Pp. 22, 3.)
[2] Revue des deux Mondes. 1851. (Tom xii. p. 1079.)
[3] Pilgrimage to El-Medinah and Mecca. (London, 1855.)

Wahabees, justified, at the beginning of the present century, in their attempts to bring back Yemen, and Syria, and Egypt, and the holy cities of Mecca and Medina (which they seized), to a supposed Shiite conformity to the Koran? or ought men to approve the act of Ibrahim Pasha in sending their leader, Abdallah, to Constantinople for execution? Are the Motazali right in supposing that the Koran is created, or were those the more orthodox Moslems who, rather than admit so impious a doctrine, preferred to remain as slaves among the Christians, asserting, with the majority of their brethren, that the book was eternal—coeval with the Creator himself? And, lastly, not to prolong this series of questions, have the mystic sects, the Sofis, any basis in the teaching of the Koran? or was there some palliation for the announcement of their great theologian, Gasali, that to slay one of these pantheising mystics, was a work of greater merit before God than to give life to ten men?[1]

And now, at length, we turn from this portion of our subject with apologies to our readers, for having dwelt upon it at so great, and we much fear, so wearisome a length. Yet our prolixity will not have been wholly in vain, if we have thereby the more succeeded in impressing on any single mind the utter erroneousness of the supposition that the Bible is the only book about whose interpretation there exist great differences of opinion. Such a conviction would serve to dispel the notion which Professor Jowett's essay seems to us calculated to foster, that the reconciliation of those difficulties is a comparatively easy task.'

II. We have now to speak of Holy Scripture as a book of prophecies (*a*) and types (*b*). And first of prophecy.

(*a.*) What we suppose the overwhelming majority of Christians to hold upon this subject may be laid down as follows:—There exists in the mind of man an instinctive craving to learn something about the future, and most nations have always believed that this desire has to some extent been gratified. Cicero declares that he knew of no exception to this rule, whether among the most polished, or the most uncivilized of races. 'Gentem quidem nullam video tam humanam atque 'doctam, neque tam immanem tamque barbaram, quæ non 'significari futura et a quibusdam intelligi prædicique posse 'censeat."[2] How far, indeed, this belief was well grounded among the nations is a distinct question, and one on which there

[1] Pococke. *Specimen Historiæ Arab.* cit. ap. Döllinger's 'Muhammed's Religion nach ihrer innern Entwickelung und ihrem Einflusse aus das Leben der Völker.' (Ratisbon.) This last short work gives an excellent summary of the sects of Islam. There is an Italian translation (Milan, 1848). Major Price's History of Mohammedanism affords a vivid picture of the sanguinary contests between these sects.

[2] De Divinatione, lib. i. cap. 1.

is legitimate room for some difference of opinion. Yet, in passing, we will venture just to intimate our own agreement with those who hold that neither sagacious guesses, nor clever stratagems for gaining early intelligence of events, nor ambiguities of construction, nor bribes from powerful and interested parties, are sufficient (though each and all played their part) to account for the measure of success and influence of the heathen oracles. We do not see how such causes can account either for the scene recorded in Acts xvi. 16—19, or the apparent cessation of the responses after the manifestation of Christ on earth.[1]

But Christians have been wont to hold that whatever conclusion be formed respecting prophecy among the heathen, there was at least one people among whom this yearning for a knowledge of futurity was truly and largely gratified. Nor is it easy to understand how any man can accept the New Testament as in any sense the word of God, without admitting the soundness of this position. As S. Augustin points out to the Manichæan Faustus, a few single verses are sufficient to condemn the inconsistency of those who, while they profess to reverence the New Testament, deny the predictive element in the Old. 'Paul, a servant of Jesus Christ, called to be an 'Apostle, separated unto the Gospel of God, *which He had* 'promised afore by His prophets in the Holy Scriptures, concern-'ing His Son Jesus Christ our Lord.' . . . 'Had ye 'believed Moses, ye would have believed Me: for he wrote of 'Me.' . . 'All things must be fulfilled, which were written 'in the law of Moses, and *in the prophets*, and *in the psalms*, 'concerning Me.' (Romans i. 1—3. S. John v. 46. S. Luke xxiv. 44).[2] Very severely, also, does Origen press his famous infidel opponent, Celsus, who recognised the existence of miracles and prophecies among the heathen, but would fain deny them to Israel. Strange, indeed, it were (runs Origen's argument) that the Jews, who knew that the heathen around them claimed powers of divination, should not have betaken themselves to these sources of information, if no light upon the future were vouchsafed at home. 'You, Celsus, tell us of 'the marvels wrought, and the responses given, by Æsculapius,

[1] Our readers will remember the noble lines of Milton:—

'The oracles are dumb,
No voice or hideous hum
Runs through the arched roof in words deceiving.
Apollo from his shrine
Can no more divine
With hollow shriek the steep of Delphos leaving.
No mighty trance, or breathed spell
Inspires the pale-ey'd priest from the prophetic cell.'

[2] S. Aug. cont. Faustum, lib. xii. cap. ii., iii. (Tom. viii. pp. 227, 8. Ed. Ben.)

'by Aristeas of Proconnesus, and others; and yet require us to 'believe that the Jews, a nation dedicated to things divine, 'never knew a single prodigy to confirm them in their faith 'towards the Creator of the universe, and in their hope of a 'better life to come.'[1] And if other gainsayers should attempt to revive the line suggested by Porphyry, and maintain that the prediction (say, for example, respecting Bethlehem as our Lord's birth-place) was written after the event, there remains the unimpeachable historical fact of the Septuagint translation of the Old Testament. For books to be translated, they must exist; and since it is thus proved, by external testimony, that the prophecy, for instance, of Micah existed some two centuries and a half before the birth of Christ, there can be no possible difficulty in believing that it may have existed seven or eight centuries before the event which it foretells.

The Jewish doctors have taught that the gift of prophecy admits of degrees. We are very far from wishing to press upon our readers a blind acquiescence in the distinctions made by teachers who too often forgot the spirit in minutely criticising the letter. But, in this instance, the views of the Rabbis, whether correct or otherwise in detail, appear to be justified in their leading features, by sound sense, and by the sanction of Holy Scripture.[2] The existence, for example, of a *gradus Mosaicus*, as the highest degree of illumination vouchsafed to man before the coming of Christ, is surely warranted both by the general tenor of the references to Moses in the New Testament, and by the express testimony of Numbers xii. 6—8, and Deuteronomy xxxiv. 10—12. And it coincides, we imagine, with the phenomena of *portions* of the prophecies of Zechariah and Ezekiel, and the dictates of sound psychology, to hold that such may represent the lowest degree; a degree wherein the imaginative faculty predominates, and the reason is not in a condition to discern the true import of the visions presented to the mind's eye; that meaning, though afterwards in part made known to the prophet, being still in a great measure involved amidst the obscurity of 'dark speeches.'

Now, we do not wish to charge Professor Jowett with disbelief in the reality of prediction on the part of the Jewish prophets. Wide as our differences are, we should never have classed either him, or his friend Dr. Temple, with Mr. Rowland Williams, Mr. H. B. Wilson, or the late Professor Baden

[1] Orig. cont. Celsum, lib. iii. § 2, 3. (Tom. i. pp. 448, 9. Ed. Ben.)

[2] See John Smith (whom we may distinguish as Smith the Platonist), Discourses—Discourse VI., *Of Prophecy*, especially, chap. ii.—It speaks highly for the value of this somewhat neglected divine, that Hengstenberg acknowledges his great obligations to him.

Powell, had they not chosen so to class themselves. Mr. Jowett and Dr. Temple do seem to us to try to look up to Scripture; the other three (and we much fear that Mr. Goodwin must be placed in the same category) write, in our humble judgment, like men who look down upon Scripture. Of Mr. Pattison we do not speak, because his essay, though we may not always like its under-current of tone, is in substance most unobjectionable. In any allusions that we may make to the volume as a whole, we must be understood to refer to the remaining six only.

Other features of prophecy may be alluded to presently. But before we proceed, we must call attention to the following remarks of Professor Jowett:—

'The failure of a prophecy is never admitted in spite of Scripture and of history (Jer. xxxvi. 30; Isaiah xxiii.; Amos vii. 10—17); the mention of a name later than the supposed age of the prophet is not allowed, as in other writings, to be taken in evidence of the date (Isaiah xiv. 1).'—P. 343.

Strange indeed it were if, from the mass of Old Testament prophecy, a few difficulties here and there could not be culled. Is it quite impossible that the mistake may lie with us, and not with the sacred volume?

In Jeremiah xxii. 30, we read: 'Thus saith the Lord, Write 'ye this man *childless*, a man that shall not prosper in his days; '*for no man of his seed shall prosper*, sitting upon the throne of 'David, and ruling any more in Judah.' Here we see that the prophet employs the term *childless*, not absolutely, but (so to speak) morally, for he proceeds in the same breath to explain, that he refers to the decadence of the king's son, not to positive failure of issue. But if he thus guards his meaning in one case, he may expect us to understand him similarly in another. Let us proceed to quote the actual language of the prophet. 'Thus 'saith the Lord to Jehoiakim, king of Judah; He shall have 'none to sit upon the throne of David; and his dead body shall 'be cast out in the day to the heat, and in the night to the 'frost.' Now, what would any one suppose if he were informed that this prophecy had failed? Surely, that Jehoiakim was succeeded by a line of kings directly descended from him; or that, at least, his son sat on the throne for some years in peace; or that his body received honourable burial. And what are the historical facts? They are these: that his son Coniah, called also Jeconias, or Jehoiakin, *did* reign in Jerusalem for three months, or (according to Josephus) for three months and ten days; that he was then carried captive to Babylon, by Nebuchadnezzar; that the young king's uncle Zedekiah, previously named Mattaniah, was made king in his stead by the

conqueror, so that the kingdom did not go, in legal language, to the heirs of Jehoiakim's body; that the descendants of Coniah never did sit on the throne of David; and that the carcase of Jehoiakim was cast out by order of the king of Babylon, without burial, before the walls.[1] We give these details that our reader may clearly understand what Professor Jowett means when he speaks of 'the failure of a prophecy.'

The next instance adduced is the twenty-third chapter of Isaiah. It is not easy to meet a vague and general objection to an entire chapter. We are left to conjecture respecting the precise point aimed at. However, we will state the case as fairly as we can, and leave it to others to decide.

The chapter in question will be found to consist of the following members: A denunciation of overthrow against the city of Tyre (verses 1—14); a promise of restoration after a period of seventy years (15—17); and, finally (18), a prediction of a time when her merchandise shall be employed, not for mere sinful luxury, but for the glory of God, and the sustenance of His servants.

We agree with Vitringa (and Dr. Davidson[2] inclines to the same view), that the most probable application of this prophecy is to the siege of Tyre, by Nebuchadnezzar. In this interpretation there is, indeed, one difficulty. Authors of great weight—the learned Jesuit Petau,[3] and we think Usher, and certainly Mr. Grote—appear to *infer* that Nebuchadnezzar did *not* destroy and lay desolate the city. We use the word *infer* advisedly, for we are really unable to perceive that it is anything but inference. Mr. Grote, very differently from his usual practice, gives no authority whatever for his assertion; and the two other writers seem to rest upon the silence of heathen authors—a mode of reasoning which, as Vitringa justly observes, would equally tend to prove that Jerusalem was not 'broken up,' and its temple and palaces destroyed by the same ruthless conqueror.

We really trust that we are open to conviction, but until the contrary is distinctly proved, we must continue to hold that Nebuchadnezzar did, *more suo*, inflict a most heavy chastisement on Palæ Tyrus, or Old Tyre, the city on the mainland; and that when it rose again, it was mainly built on the island,[4] nearly a mile distant, and thus became that New Tyre which cost Alexander the Great so troublesome a siege.

---

[1] Josephus, Antiq. lib. x. cap. vi. § 3.

[2] Introduction to the Old Testament, p. 844.

[3] Petavius, de Doctrinâ Temporum. Cit. ap. Vitringa *in loc.*

[4] 'We have no means of determining the origin of the island city; but it must, of course, have arisen in the period between Nebuchadnezzar and Alexander the Great.'—Smith's 'Greek and Roman Geography,' art. Tyrus.

The other features of Nebuchadnezzar's conquest may be fitly given in the words of a writer already referred to, one who assuredly will not be suspected of warping historic facts in order to make out an agreement with Holy Scripture.

'Nebuchadnezzar further attacked the Phenician cities, and the siege of Tyre alone cost him severe toil for thirteen years. After this long and gallant resistance, the Tyrians were forced to submit, and underwent the same fate as the Jews: their princes and chiefs were dragged captive into the Babylonian territory, and the Phenician cities became numbered among the tributaries of Nebuchadnezzar. So they seemed to have remained until the overthrow of Babylon by Cyrus; for we find among those extracts (unhappily very brief) which Josephus has preserved out of the Tyrian annals, that, during this interval, there was dispute and irregularities in the government of Tyre, judges being for a time substituted in the place of kings; while Merbal and Hirom, two princes of the regal Tyrian line, detained captive in Babylonia, were successively sent down on the special petition of the Tyrians, and reigned at Tyre—the former four years, the latter twenty years—until the conquest of Babylon by Cyrus. The Egyptian king Apriês, indeed, son of Psammis and grandson of Neliôs, attacked Sidon and Tyre, both by land and sea, but seemingly without any result. To the Persian empire, as soon as Cyrus had conquered Babylon, they cheerfully and spontaneously submitted, whereby the restoration of the captive Tyrians to their home was probably conceded to them, like that of the captive Jews.'—*Grote's History of Greece*, vol. iii. p. 438.

If this be 'the failure of a prophecy,' we should like to know what is to be considered its fulfilment. It is nothing forced or unreasonable to date the commencement of the seventy years from the beginning of Nebuchadnezzar's career of conquest: though this is not necessary for the literal fulfilment of the text which names that lapse of time as the epoch of a thoroughly reinstated prosperity.

There remains, however, the concluding verse of the chapter. We are not in a position, at the present stage of our inquiry, to discuss whether this or any other prophecy may receive a lesser fulfilment before its final one. Suffice it to say, that the belief that the accomplishment of this prediction was to take place in the times of the Messiah has not been confined to Christian expositors of Scripture, but has been proclaimed likewise by those famous Jewish commentators, Kimchi and Jarchi. They were right in their view, though wrong in vainly looking forward to a time which had come and gone. First fruits of that race was she, the Syro-Phœnician by nation, whose sublime and touching speech to our Lord, when He went into the borders of Tyre and Sidon, won for her a share of the children's bread, the liberation of her daughter from the evil spirit that afflicted her. Children, too, of that gracious promise made through Isaiah were they who received S. Paul at Tyre, on his journey to Jerusalem (Acts xxi. 3); and those, too, of the same country, who under Diocletian sealed their faith with their

blood. And when the tide of persecution rolled away, when on every side, instead of humble and often ruined oratories, arose churches worthy of Christian worship, there was one city so lavish in its magnificence, that Eusebius devotes a long chapter of his history to the account of the building and its dedication. *The name of that city was Tyre.*

If there be any errors in this exposition, we shall be more than willing to have them pointed out. If there be any truth and soundness in it, it is no merit of ours, but is entirely due to a single commentator. Some points we had, indeed, excogitated for ourselves, but even in these we found that we had been completely anticipated by the exhaustive erudition and acuteness of Vitringa.[1]

The next instance adduced is a passage from the book of Amos (vii. 10—17). We are again left to conjecture as to the precise point of the objection: but we must presume that it turns upon the eleventh verse of the chapter. 'For thus Amos 'saith, *Jeroboam shall die by the sword*, and Israel shall surely be 'led away captive out of their own land.' Now we all know that Jeroboam II. did not die by the sword, but simply 'slept with his fathers.' (2 Kings xiv. 29.)

It is certainly desirable, that before we discuss the question of the fulfilment, or non-fulfilment of words assigned to a prophet, we should take the trouble to ascertain whether the prophet really uttered them. If anything was ever clear at a glance to the merest schoolboy who should read this chapter of Amos, it is that the prophet himself never uttered this prophecy at all. We could easily direct our readers to two well-known commentaries where this is pointed out. But, in truth, it needs no commentary. The real prophecy that Amos did proclaim is given just immediately before, in the ninth verse. To him, and through him, did the Almighty proclaim, 'I will rise against the house of Jeroboam with the sword;' a real prophecy, most literally fulfilled in the successful revolt of Shallum against Jeroboam's son Zachariah, whom Shallum 'slew, and reigned in his stead' (2 Kings xv. 10). The version of Amos's words given by Amaziah, the priest of Bethel, to Jeroboam, presents the exact species of distortion that in every age is frequently exhibited by a crafty and unscrupulous enemy. But it has probably been reserved to our own age, to make Amos responsible not only for what he did say, but for what his scheming adversary reported him to have said. If this be the real point of the alleged failure of a prophecy—and we cannot conceive that the passage admits of any other attack—then we

[1] Cornelius à Lapide *in loc.* though far less full in detail, entirely agrees with Vitringa.

must really take the liberty of saying that it does display a degree of precipitancy which would be truly astonishing if applied to the text of Thucydides or Plato, and which is certainly not less so when it concerns the interpretation of Scripture.

There remain, on this head, the passages of Isaiah, relating to Cyrus. The mention of the name 'is not allowed,' Mr. Jowett complains, 'to be taken in evidence of the date.' We suppose not; and for this obvious reason, that such a procedure involves a manifest *petitio principii*. Either true predictions have, *Dei gratiâ*, been pronounced by mortal men, or they have not. If they have not, the question is at an end, and the words of S. Paul and of our Lord Himself must be interpreted anew, or else pronounced meaningless, or something worse. But if such predictions have been made, then it is a mere question of degree, whether a given prophecy does or does not include the certain particular details: as for example, that of a name. The name may be foretold by way of command, as 'thou shalt call his name John' (S. Luke i. 13), 'thou shalt call his name JESUS' (S. Matthew i. 21); or as a simple prediction, 'a child shall be born unto the house of David, Josiah by name' (1 Kings xiii. 2); or 'that saith of Cyrus, He is my shepherd, . . . Cyrus, whose right hand I have holden' (Isaiah xliv. 28; xlv. 1).

That great and glorious monarch is here, as Dr. Davidson justly remarks, 'mentioned by name; but not represented as the 'King of Persia. He is an Oriental hero, raised up by Jehovah, 'to execute His purposes respecting the Chaldeans; and the 'mode in which he is spoken of corresponds with the ideal posi-'tion of the prophet.'[1] And surely, if any among the heathen might have a claim, so to speak, to be foretold by name, it was that Gentile type of Christ (as Christian Fathers have not hesitated to call him), who rescued the chosen race from their sad captivity, by the waters of Babylon, and enabled them again to sing the songs of Zion in a land that was not strange.

If any of our readers should wish to examine the question of the authenticity of the entire section of Isaiah, contained in chapters xl.—lxvi., we recommend to their notice the discussion in the work of Dr. Davidson (pp. 849—862) from which we have just quoted. To our (not, we own, unprejudiced) understanding, it appears to be eminently frank, clear, and satisfactory.

(*b.*) Let thus much be said, for the present, respecting prediction, properly so called. We have now to speak of Holy Scripture as a book containing types: that is to say, *acted* instead of *spoken* prophecies. The groundwork of a belief in

[1] Introduction to the Old Testament. (P. 854.)

types lies in the fact that some such are openly proclaimed in Holy Scripture, whence arises a strong degree of probability that others, not palpably announced, were intended to be discovered by research. (This is not wholly dissimilar from the case of the parables, of which their Divine Author has explicitly given the key in some cases, and left us to discover the signification of the remainder.) And such research has never lacked devoted applicants. To say that an Origen, or a S. Clement, or a S. Austin may at times have pressed it too far—to pause before accepting every exemplification supplied by Dean Trench, or Lord Lindsay,[1] or even by Bishop Pearson—is of course an admission in terms, that there *is* a limit, within which such pursuit of resemblances is safe and profitable.

And let not any think that a keen and vivid perception of these types is a privilege of any single age, or class, or country. Alike in East and West, in primitive and mediæval times, before and since the Reformation, among Lutherans, Calvinists, Anglicans, Roman Catholics, Dissenters, among the illiterate as well as the highly educated, this study has been a delight. It has formed one link of union amongst Christians who differ the most widely, and such links are not too many. Something must, indeed, be allowed to individual temperament. S. Athanasius will not be found to dwell on types as does S. Clement of Alexandria; the Lutheran Paul Gerhardt seems to enjoy them in a way which is not recognised by the famous Jesuit commentator Maldonatus, who may be said rather to tolerate than to admire this kind of symbolism. But most especially do they appeal with force to the minds of Christ's poor. Clergy who make the attempt may easily discover this. Well do we remember asking the schoolmistress in a midland county parish to show us the most popular religious books in the village lending-library. The very first exhibited was a little book by a Scotch Presbyterian, 'McEwen on the Types.'

Whatever be thought of such exhibitions as the *Ammergau Mystery*, the English critics in the *Times*, and *Guardian*, and *Macmillan's Magazine*, all remarked on its eminently Scriptural character. Now, there were shown on this occasion, before the actual scenes of the Redeemer's Passion, representations of some types of the events from the Old Testament. For types are everywhere understood and appreciated by the poor, alike in the Tyrol and Northamptonshire.

There must be some wonderful hold upon the human heart in a system of interpretation that has lived through so many storms and flourished in such diverse soils. The one obvious way of

[1] Progression by Antagonism.

accounting for such vitality seems to us to be this: that it is rooted in God's eternal truth.

Let us imagine for a moment a volume composed of selections from the classics of ancient Greece and Rome. Conjoin in it, say, for example, some books of Herodotus, a few odes of Pindar, a tragedy of Æschylus, the 'Republic' of Plato, biographies from Plutarch, the 'Agricola' of Tacitus, and letters of Cicero, Pliny, and Seneca. No one in his senses would ever be persuaded that some one conspicuous personage in the later of these works was being constantly typified in the earlier ones. But, when it is suggested to devout minds that the Law finds its antitype in the Gospel, when the image of the promised Messiah is pointed out, however dimly, as moving along the entire line of the Old Testament history; sold, unjustly condemned, restored, exalted in Joseph; the lawgiver to God's people in Moses; the leader into a better Canaan than that entered by the conquering Joshua; prophesying and ruling in the person of David; the prince of peace in the youthful Solomon; the re-conductor of the chosen race to their native home in Zerubbabel;—when, we say, these and many kindred thoughts are suggested, they find upon the whole, with whatever rare and occasional exceptions, a place ready prepared for them in the hearts of myriads of Christians. Let those who will attempt to find some other reasons for the vast difference between the collection of the books of the two Testaments and all other collections of books, actual or hypothetical, in this respect. We know but of one sufficient and satisfactory reason; namely, that the assemblage of books in the Bible forms one organic whole, and that in this, as in so many other ways, it differs from and transcends all other books:—

> 'Unde nil majus generatur ipso,
> Nec viget quidquam simile aut secundum.'

And if indeed the doctrine of types in Scripture be based upon a sound foundation, we must not allow ourselves to be scared from its use, because it may be, or has been, abused; because it may, like many other things that are good and true, have its own peculiar dangers to be guarded against.

> 'By the common cry the common mind
> Is buoyed aloft; be it not so with us.
> Whatsoe'er possible evils lie before,
> Let us sincerely own them to ourselves,
> With all unstinting, unevasive hearts:
> Reposing in the consciousness of strength,
> Or fervent hope to be endowed with strength
> Of all-enduring temper,—*daring all truth*.'[1]

[1] Henry Taylor's 'Isaac Comnenus.'

What is the treatment which the subject of types receives in Mr. Jowett's Essay? On this, as on many other topics treated in 'Essays and Reviews,' it is by no means easy to obtain a plain answer to a plain question; but the general impression left upon the mind is that our author objects to the typical interpretation. At p. 381 we read as follows:—

'It is true also that there are types in Scripture which were regarded as such by the Jews themselves, as for example, the scapegoat, or the paschal lamb.'

This language is ambiguous, because the real question at issue is, not whether the Jews regarded the goat and the lamb as types (which no one, we suppose, questions), but whether they were right in so regarding them. We are really quite unable to make out whether Professor Jowett does, or does not, intend to express a belief in the reality of these types. But we trust that he does believe in them, and proceed to the words which follow:—

'But that is no proof of all outward ceremonies being types when Scripture is silent.'

Assuredly not of *all*, but it affords (to say the very least) a fair ground of presumption for *some*. We are again perplexed to know whether the writer admits the truth of *some*. If he does, the principle is conceded. As regards the theory, that we are bound to confine ourselves to those typical applications which are explicitly recognised in Holy Scripture, we may again borrow some cogent observations from Dr. Davidson, which, however, we are compelled, from lack of space, to relegate to a foot-note.[1]

---

[1] 'That this view is inadequate and narrow will be seen from the following considerations:—

'Various places in the New Testament intimate, or expressly assert, that most of the institutions peculiar to the old, prefigured spiritual things under the new economy. The Epistle to the Hebrews plainly shows that the entire Levitical law, with its sacrifices, rites, and priests, foreshadowed better things. Comp. x. 1, etc.; vii. 11—22; viii. 1—13; ix. 1; x. 18. The same view is given by Paul in the Epistle to the Colossians, ii. 17. The Epistle to the Galatians has it also (Galat. iii. iv.). If, then, the general character of an entire economy be typical, whilst the various parts of it are nowhere explained in the New Testament so as to show their spiritual correlatives, any interpreter has no more certain guide than he who holds it unnecessary to quote the express testimony of Scripture in favour of one thing or person foreshadowing another. . . . . It is admitted that types partake of the nature of prophecy. Now, in order to connect the thing or person described in the prophecy as future with its counterpart, we do not require the exposition of the Scripture writers themselves. A prophecy *is not said in Scripture*, in most cases, to be fulfilled in a person or event, even where we have reason to believe that it is so. No one dreams of demanding the express testimony of an inspired writer for the purpose of demonstrating the meaning of what is fulfilled. What was predicted is not identified with its counterpart when the latter takes place. Why, then, should a different rule be applied to types? Why should their spiritual sense be every where pointed out by the Scripture writers

It may be necessary, however, before quitting this part of the discussion, to call attention to the following words of Professor Jowett:—

'The Protestant divine who perceives that the types and figures of the Old Testament are employed by Roman Catholics in support of the tenets of their Church, will be careful not to use weapons which it is impossible to guide, and which may with equal force be turned against himself.'—P. 342.

Now we must repeat that the primary question concerning the general principle of symbolical interpretation, or any other theological tenet whatever, must be—*Is it true?* If it can be proved untrue, it is thereby at once condemned, and ought not to be employed by any controversialist in any cause. If the theory of types be true, it may be employed to confirm and illustrate that which is proved on other grounds, but certainly should not be appealed to as a proof in and by itself. This is no *ex post facto* rule, summoned up by us for the occasion. It is a principle of sound sense admitted, nay, enforced, by writers of different ages and different training. 'And thus, no confusion follows 'in Holy Scripture, since all senses are founded on one, namely, 'the literal, *from which alone can an argument be drawn;* and 'not from those things which are spoken allegorically, as Augus-'tine observes in his Epistle against the Donatist Vincentius. 'And yet no injury thereby accrues to Holy Scripture, because 'there is not anything essential to the faith contained under the 'spiritual sense, which Scripture does not elsewhere clearly 'deliver by the literal sense.'[1] Modern writers, who are not likely to have copied from this statement of Aquinas, nor that of Augustine, to which he appeals, have laid down principles precisely identical.

That there is any serious danger from Roman Catholic controversialists in this matter we must venture to regard as a phantom of the imagination. It is true that one pious and respected English clergyman did, some seventeen or eighteen years since, ground his secession to the Roman communion on arguments derived from the types of the Old Testament. But it is also true that he gave a practical reply to his own reasonings by returning, within the space of two or three years, to the Church of England, which he has ever since served with the most remarkable fidelity and zeal. There is infinitely more danger of gain accruing to Rome through the recoil caused by such a work

themselves? Are we not warranted in assuming that there are predictions in the Old Testament which were at least partially fulfilled in circumstances and persons belonging to the New, without its being expressly said that they *were* so fulfilled? In like manner may it be inferred that some types are not indicated in the New Testament which must nevertheless have been really such?'—*Introduction, &c.* pp. 438, 9.

[1] Summa Theologiæ, Qu. I. Art. 10. § 1.

as 'Essays and Reviews' than from any conceivable indulgence in Scripture typology.

And so far as our humble voice may reach, we do protest against resigning to the Church of Rome a rich and beatific territory, which, up to the present time, has been regarded as the common heritage of Christendom. By all means let Christian teachers use the safeguards of sound sense, of the analogy of the faith, of prayer and watchfulness, in this as in every other portion of their Biblical studies and expositions. But with these aids, the investigation of types in their proper place will be found not merely hallowing and elevating, but an excellent, though indirect preservative against many of the chief dangers of the day. For it vindicates, as we have intimated, the claim of the Bible to be unique and transcendent among books.

III. Our next subject of consideration stands in such close connexion with the preceding, that, on the one hand, we have slightly anticipated it, while, on the other, some remarks upon the subject of prophecy have been deferred, because they seemed to have their proper place under what follows.

Our third heading has already indicated what we believe to be the true reply to the query, whether Holy Scripture may ever lawfully admit of more interpretations than one.

Professor Jowett teaches that there is one literal sense in Holy Scripture, namely, that intended by the writer.

Now, most certainly it was not left to the nineteenth century to make such a discovery as this. But that the Professor's reading does not seem to lie in that direction, he might be supposed to have borrowed from the language of the chief among the schoolmen: '*sensus literalis est, quem auctor intendit.*'[1] And Aquinas is here only laying down what his great master, Augustine, had evidently taught before him, and what so many commentators on Holy Scripture were to teach after him. (Thus, by way of example, we may refer to a remark of Vitringa on the passage of Isaiah already discussed. He is willing to admit the existence of a mystical sense in the prediction relative to Tyre, with this restriction: 'ut secundum primum, proprium et verum sensum, *à Prophetâ intentum*, hìc intelligatur Tyrus propriè sic dicta.')

And is this primary sense all? May there not sometimes be, beyond the literal sense intended by the writer, another sense which the words are capable of bearing and were meant to bear, by that Holy Spirit who inspired the thoughts that have been uttered? Nay, is it wholly impossible that even the words of uninspired men may, from time to time, be capable of a some-

[1] Summa Theologiæ. Pars. I. Qu. I. Art. 10.

what similar increase of extent or depth? We believe that they both may and do receive it. There may be many forms of this: three more especially occur to us.

Firstly, then, it happens (as even Mr. Jowett seems inclined to grant) in the case of writers of great genius. Gifted with a combination of powers which are rarely found in conjunction, with the reasoning faculty fully developed by the side of an ardent and affluent imagination, entering with a singular range of sympathy into the nature of their fellow-men, they utter words which reach beyond the accidents of their own age and country, and again and again bear reference to events of which the speakers did not dream. And thus Demosthenes seems at moments to be attacking the first Napoleon; and Cicero, through the mouth of an English peer, denounces a popular leader from Ireland; and Dante, in his bitter sarcasm against his still much-loved Florence, may be almost thought to prophesy of modern Paris; and Shakspeare, and even Horace, are every day found to point a moral in the family circle or in public assemblies; and Plato, in drawing a picture of a good man persecuted and a wicked man outwardly triumphant, unconsciously pourtrays, so that thousands recognize the likeness, the features of the CHRIST and the Antichrist.

But all these, it will be urged, are instances of application, not of interpretation. We by no means deny the real existence of such a distinction, but we cannot allow the possibility of its being always drawn with the sharpness and the facility which Mr. Jowett seems to believe in. What may be application on the part of one man frequently involves interpretation on the part of another. When Lord Brougham has addressed his audience (as he declares he has frequently done) in periods which were literally translated from the Olynthiacs or Philippics, *he* was, no doubt, making an application, but his hearers *interpreted* the words as a comment on certain events of their own day. The change from Greek to English in this instance does not affect the general question. We have heard of a speaker introducing passages from Burke in a similar manner. And this is one way in which words may acquire a meaning beyond the intention of their author.

A *second* mode arises out of the superior enlightenment of one person's conscience as compared with that of another. Just as scenes of nature or creations of art speak very differently to different minds, even so too does it happen to the hearers of the self-same words. Among those who are addressed by any Christian teacher, it is probable that there may be several who far surpass the instructor, not, perhaps, in actual head knowledge, but in all the evangelical graces. On such hearers language

often falls with a power beyond that of him who utters it. Ideas that he never conceived are imparted, vague directions turned into practical rules for life, light is shed on what was dark, consolation given to sorrows which have been borne in silence, and the knowledge about God and the soul increased and deepened in a manner that bears fruit for time and for eternity.

Nor dare we limit such divinely guided interpretation to those who may have listened to the teachers of nations placed beneath the sway of the patriarchal, or Mosaic, or Christian dispensations. Numbers there have been, in widely severed times and lands, less favoured in the degree of truth made known to them, who have yet earnestly sought to be religious according to their share of light. And who shall tell how much the words of the Vedas, or the Zendavesta, or the Koran, may have been blest by God to the illumination of those who have yearned for truth in a spirit of humility and love? Deep as are many of the thoughts enshrined in such works, the human heart has depths beyond them; and the Spirit of God has never ceased to brood over those troubled waters. What may sentences of a Pindar and a Plato, a Proclus or Cleanthes, or even of a Persius or a Seneca, have been permitted to achieve? A single treatise of Cicero leads a S. Austin forward on his road to Christ. Lofty indeed has been the privilege of those whose language was capable of being in such wise understood.

'Angel-voices may have whispered, borne—aye, even on death's chill blast,—
While they groped out towards our future, as we grope back toward their past.'[1]

All that is pure, ennobling, elevating, as in the books reverenced by the Orientals, so too, in the Western classics, has indeed come from God. And wherever any have learnt from them more than the writers meant, that operation, in so far as it has been good, has been effected by the Holy Ghost.

But there is a *third* case of such extension of the meaning of men's speeches, closely connected with this last, but very different in form. There are consciences, not wholly seared, which feel the burden of past offences, if not in a spirit of Christian penitence, yet at least with shame, and with remorse for the injury wrought to self-respect. To this large class the words of their fellow-men are again and again fraught with humiliation and rebuke. At moments they can hardly believe but that the secrets of their hearts are known to those who, in utter unconsciousness, have so severely probed their wounds.

[1] Poems by the late Hon. H. R. Skeffington.

'Thus oft it haps, that when within
They shrink at sense of secret sin,
A feather daunts the brave;
A fool's wild speech confounds the wise,
And proudest princes vail their eyes
Before their meanest slave.'

Now that which in occasional and exceptional ways is true of merely human speech, that we maintain to be throughout a distinguishing characteristic of God's Word. It cannot, of course, by any possibility, teach doctrines which are really contradictory; it cannot teach that there is and is not a heaven, that there is and is not a hell, that Christ our Lord is and is not very and eternal God. If any of its principles seem to be at variance—as, for example, the recognition of man's free agency with God's over-ruling sovereignty—we believe such seeming contrariety to arise from our ignorance; the more so as we observe that it is a difficulty common alike to philosophy and religion of every kind, a difficulty by no means introduced into men's minds by revelation, though confessedly, like many other mysteries, left unsolved by it. But in Holy Scripture, although there may be in general one paramount sense, the existence of other senses is not thereby excluded. On this account the Church has always shrunk from pronouncing in any authoritative manner that any one text of Scripture *must* bear a given sense, *and that alone.* It was the Arians of old, not their Catholic opponents, who placed certain interpretations of particular texts in Scripture under the sanction of an anathema. The general principle for which we are contending, though implied in numberless commentaries, both ancient and modern, has seldom, we think, been more clearly put forth than in the following passage from a recent publication:—

'It is this controlling power which constitutes the inspiration 'of Holy Scripture. If we recognize Scripture as really ema-'nating from God the Holy Ghost, although written with a 'very inadequate appreciation of the Divine purpose, by human 'agency, we shall scarcely be able to avoid the acknowledgment, 'that there must be in all the words of Scripture a Divine pur-'pose and meaning, over and above, not contrary to or nullify-'ing, but underlying, pervading, spiritualizing, what the writers 'would have intended had they merely written as men. To us 'it is a matter of no concern how far they felt this control; but 'if we allow the Divine inspiration of Scripture, we cannot limit 'it by the consciousness or intelligence of the writers, any more 'than we can limit the operation of Divine grace in the sacra-'ments by the intention or theological acumen of the minister. 'The spiritual intention of God, in accordance with which Holy

'Scripture was inspired, neither involves an habitual conscious-
'ness in the writers that more was meant than met the ear, nor
'does it exclude the primary intention of the writers in the record
'of facts, or the administration of encouragement and reproof.'[1]

We have spoken of a partial anticipation of the subject of this section. This anticipation occurs in our remarks upon types. If *any* true types exist, here is at least one evident proof that the meaning of Holy Writ cannot, in all cases, be limited to that one sense for which Professor Jowett contends.

Again, we have already made allusion to what is called the double sense of prophecy. Time was, when a head-master of Rugby gave to the world two admirable sermons upon this subject, and expressed the satisfaction which he felt at having something in common with teachers to whom he was so much opposed; and, if we mistake not, distinguished pupils of that great man have before now followed in the self-same track. Other times, other manners. The successor of Dr. Arnold, to our great regret, leads the van in a book which (implicitly at least) condemns every other than the literal sense. Deserted by those whom we might have hoped to find allies, we shall employ the description of this two-fold sense which is given by Dr. Davidson. We appeal to this most learned and candid Non-conformist because he, at any rate, will hardly be accused of showing any undue deference to the *dicta* of Fathers or Councils to Church authority in any shape. 'The prophetic cha-
'racter of the Book of Daniel is attested by our Lord in Matt.
'xxxiv. 14, where we learn that the words of Daniel, in ix. 26,
'refer to the desecration of the temple in the Roman war. This
'is not contrary to their allusion to Antiochus and his desecra-
'tion of the temple, which was the primary and sole sense in
'the view of the prophet himself; for the same prophetic
'utterances may and do refer to more events than one. They
'are partially, but not completely, fulfilled at once, having
'a *springing* or *germinant* sense. In this way the sense of
'a prophecy may not be at once exhausted; it remains in
'the course of history, and is gradually realized by succes-
'sive events of a similar kind, prefigurative of one another.
'Thus the desolations of Antiochus were again enacted by the
'Romans. And the Apostolic predictions of Antichrist lead us
'to expect that a persecuting blasphemer of like spirit with
'Antiochus, is to come at the end of days, when this prophecy
'of Daniel will be *exhaustively* and *perfectly* fulfilled. Each suc-
'ceeding fulfilment foreshadows and prepares for the last one."[2]

[1] 'The Wisdom of the Son of David: an exposition of the first nine chapters of the Book of Proverbs. (London: Bell and Daldy), *Preface*, pp. xi. xii.

[2] *Ubi supra*, p. 915.

Allegorical and mystical interpretation we confess to be a very difficult subject, which would be well worthy of a separate treatise. Precise rules on this head are indeed impossible. But how mystical interpretation can be wholly set aside, we do not see; unless we are prepared to reject the teaching of so many of the Christian, as well as Jewish, doctors, respecting the meaning of the Song of Songs: how allegory can be wholly eliminated from the possible meanings of Scripture we are equally unable to imagine, so long as S. Paul's account of one of the significations of the history of the two sons of Abraham remains in the canons. (Galat. iv. 22—31.)

But whatever be the dangers of allegorization and mysticism on the part of human interpreters, the general principle that we have been engaged in laying down remains untouched. When the Spirit of Jehovah spake by men, and his word was in their tongue (2 Samuel xxiii. 2), they knew not the full force of what they spake; and that self-same Spirit, in after years, condescended to inspire others to bring out the varied bearings and deeper significance of their language. Moses may issue the literal precept 'neither shall ye break a bone thereof' (Exod. xii. 46), and S. John be divinely led to declare, that this Scripture is fulfilled in the treatment of the true Paschal Lamb upon Mount Calvary; Isaiah may represent our Lord as bearing our griefs and carrying our sorrows, as a part of his *personal* suffering, and yet S. Matthew have a Divine warrant for applying the prediction to those cures which were wrought by His sympathy as perfect man, as well as by His authority as God (S. Matt. viii. 17); Heman the Ezrahite may utter his grievous complaint in that Psalm (the 88th) which alone, of the entire collection, breathes no joy, and yet the Church be justified in hearing in its notes the complaint of the human soul of our Saviour while detained in Hades; the doctrine of the resurrection may be unconsciously implied by Moses in the very title by which he addresses his Maker at the bush; Eliakim may, in some sense, bear on his shoulder that key of David which is assigned in the Apocalypse to Him who alone can wield its awful powers; Balaam, with earth's prizes in his heart, may yet behold a star which shall rise in David, but culminate, with unimagined brightness, in David's Son; Caiaphas, the unworthy high priest, is still permitted, by virtue of his office, to utter words that come 'not of himself,' to prophesy, unknowing what he spake, of the atoning sacrifice for all the children of God; and the goodly choir of the righteous prophets at large, vainly sound the depths of their own minds, 'searching what, or what manner of time, the Spirit of Christ 'which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the 'sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow.'

But there is, we need scarcely say, one marked exception to this ignorance: there is one speaker, whose words are recorded in the Bible, who could not be unconscious of any single particular respecting the possible interpretation of His sayings. This may be one reason why 'it is, perhaps, the greatest difficulty of all to enter into the meaning of the words of Christ,' as Mr. Jowett observes in the beautiful passage already cited from his essay. This may be one reason why the 'Five Clergymen' have found, contrary to all *à priori* surmises, that it is less difficult to revise a version of the Epistle to the Romans, than of the Gospel according to S. John. Even commentators of a rationalistic bias of mind seem unable to preserve a consistent denial of the existence of more than a single meaning in the words of Christ. 'De Wette' (remarks Olshausen, on S. John xi. 9) 'considers it contrary to the rules of exposition as well as 'to the spirit of the Gospel, that we should attach more than one 'sense to a declaration of Christ, *whilst in other passages he has 'himself maintained the very thing to which he here objects.* Surely 'we ought not to pronounce the profound language of Christ 'destitute of that which is readily acknowledged in a Shakspeare 'or a Jean Paul.'[1]

Professor Jowett's treatment of this part of his subject appears to us remarkably inaccurate. It would, indeed, be mere hypocrisy to pretend that we reckon accuracy as one of his characteristics at any time. We all, indeed, make slips, reviewers and reviewed—

'Cædimus, inque vicem præbemus crura sagittis.'

But the amount and glaring character of Mr. Jowett's errors very far exceed the average. His confusion, for instance, of two perfectly distinct and well-known parables (S. Matt. xiii. 45; S. Luke xiv. 8), in the words 'we hope also at times that we have found the pearl of great price after sweeping the house,' (p. 414,) is probably unequalled in the writings of any highly educated clergyman. On the matter, however, now in hand, his mistakes appear to arise from ignorance of what those whom he opposes really hold and teach. And since he is utterly incapable of anything like wilful misrepresentation, we are driven to suppose that his theological reading has not been at all co-extensive either with the reach of those high abilities, or with that religious earnestness, which we so fully recognize in him.

We cannot afford to quote more than a few fragments of Mr. Jowett's essay respecting this topic. But it is our earnest wish to cite them fairly. At page 334 we read:—

[1] Olshausen on the Gospels. (Vol. iv. p. 6, Eng. Trans.)

'We do not at once see the absurdity of the same words having many senses, or free our minds from the illusion that an Apostle or Evangelist must have written with a reference to the creeds, or controversies, or circumstances of other times.'—P. 334.

So far as regards the charge of absurdity against the views that, over and above the literal sense intended by the writers, the Holy Spirit may have so guided them that their words should embrace other meanings, we are content to refer to what we have already said. But it is worth while, at this point, to ask from what quarter the Regius Professor of Greek in Oxford can obtain any countenance to his limitation of the words of Scripture to a single sense alone? Certainly not from Scripture itself, for there (as we have seen) more than one sense is again and again recognized. From what school, then, of interpreters? Not from Fathers, ante-Nicene or post-Nicene; not from Schoolmen; not from Reformers; not from the works of great preachers in any Christian community whatever; not from the hymnology of mediæval Christendom or of Lutheran Germany; not from famous commentators—on the Protestant side, as Vitringa; on the Roman Catholic side, as Cornelius à Lapide—not from our famous sixteenth or seventeenth century divines, as Hooker or Pearson, or Andrews; not from the somewhat liberalised Dr. Arnold, or from the somewhat Calvinistic Thomas Scott.

Yet there is *one* age from which Mr. Jowett may obtain some support for his view, and that is the century, or century and a half, succeeding the Revolution of 1688. And that age —what was it as a teacher concerning the supernatural? Shall *we* pause to characterize it? Shall we cite anything from Dean Trench, or Dr. Arnold, or Mr. Gladstone, on this head? Nay, verily; we need not go one step beyond the pages of *Essays and Reviews*. Nowhere has a more unsparing dissection of its weaknesses appeared than in the masterly survey of Mr. Pattison. 'It was an age destitute of earnestness; an age 'whose poetry was without romance, whose philosophy was 'without insight, and whose public men were without cha-'racter; an age of 'light without love,' whose 'very merits were 'of the earth, earthy.'[1] And is this the age to which we should look for leading principles in the interpretation of Scripture? Surely, if a given maxim in these matters was then, and then only, predominant, that very circumstance would be a sufficient ground for a *primâ facie* distrust of its merits.

But besides this 'absurdity' (in which some nine-tenths of the most famous Christian teachers of all ages and countries are

[1] Mr. Pattison's Essay, *ad init.* (Essays and Reviews, p. 254.)

more or less involved), there is an 'illusion' about Evangelists and Apostles writing with reference to 'other times;' that is to say, we presume, other times than their own.

Was S. Peter then, under an illusion, when he assured those whom he addressed, that the prophets, 'not unto themselves, but unto us, did minister the things which are now reported?' (1 S. Peter i. 12.) If not—if prophets, living under a more imperfect dispensation, could minister, and know that they ministered, to those who should enjoy the full light of the Gospel—why should it be an illusion to suppose that Apostles, who had seen the Lord and had been dowered with Pentecostal gifts, should be privileged to write words which God of His mercy has left abiding with us, as a test that bears upon all creeds, all controversies, all circumstances of the spiritual life alike of communities and individuals? We maintain that it is *no* illusion, but a blessed truth. S. John may not have foreseen the error of Apollinaris, nor have written with reference to it; but his pen was moved to record expressions of His Divine Master (as, '*now is My soul troubled*'), which condemn it by anticipation; he did not predict the rise of Paulicianism or Mormonism, but provision is made in his pages for the opposition to each of these deadly evils. And so on, *mutatis mutandis*, throughout every page of the New Testament.

The belief in the types of the Mosaic law and the double meanings of prophecy is shortly, according to Mr. Jowett (p. 419), to vanish away. The following sentence forms part of the reasoning upon which this belief is based:—

'The mystical explanations of Origen or Philo were not seen to be mystical; the reasonings of Aquinas and Calvin were not supposed to go beyond the letter of the text.'—P. 419.

We find it extremely difficult to lend any credence to what is here asserted concerning the *Christian* divines alluded to. Plato is, no doubt, in part the originator of the Alexandrian school; and no one understood better than Plato, the distinction between a literal and a symbolical meaning, a *ὑπονοία* as it is termed in the 'Republic.' Respecting the darkness asserted by Mr. Jowett to be prevailing of yore over the explanations of the Jewish divine, Philo, we are not prepared to speak with confidence; but it is hard to believe in it when we find our author in the same breath pronouncing a similar opinion about Origen. For in this last case the assertion is simply absurd. No one who had ever really studied Origen could maintain, *εἰ μὴ θέσιν διαφυλάττων*, that he left his readers the slightest excuse for the non-perception of the distinction between his literal and his mystical interpretations: and so far were the

Fathers of a later date from not seeing this, that Epiphanius, S. Jerome, and S. Augustine, condemn the excessive abnegation of the letter into which that great genius had let himself be carried.[1] At a later period, Aquinas, in his well-known and most valuable *Catena Aurea*, takes the greatest pains to insert the word '*mystically*,' as a warning before those explanations of Origen, S. Hilary, and others, which are of a figurative character.

With respect to the reasonings of Aquinas we are certainly most unwilling to commit ourselves to them without much reserve. They are sometimes built too much on the verbal force of the vulgate rendering: they sometimes carry refinement beyond the point which we can feel safe or sound. Yet, in stating our grounds of difference with the Angelic Doctor, as he was called of yore, we much prefer to follow the lead of Bishop Pearson to that of Professor Jowett. In one of those recovered lectures, of which we owe the possession to the editorial care of Archdeacon Churton, that great theologian points out the main sources of our differences with the schoolmen. Their appeals to the apocryphal books of Scripture, to the decrees of non-œcumenical councils, to spurious works of Fathers, to the *dictum* of any single Bishop of Rome (he might have added, in the case of Aquinas, to the teaching of Aristotle), *as final and unimpeachable authorities*—it is on these grounds, far more than on any wresting of Holy Writ, that the Bishop bases his objections to the schoolmen, while he recommends the study of their works. 'Satis quidem sunt acuti in illationibus conclusionum, 'satis in deductionibus assertionum perspicaces. *Sed in ipsis* '*locis ex quibus reliqua deducunt sæpissimè peccant, et in ipsis* '*principiis unde disputant semper aliquid est reformandum.*'

We turn to Calvin. Our objection to him and to his followers as interpreters of Holy Scripture is not that which Mr. Jowett advances in this place of his Essay (p. 419), but that very different and seemingly opposite one, which he alleges in another place of his Essay (p. 366). As, however, in this last-named page, the disciples of the Genevese reformer are alternately apologised for and rebuked, it is only fair to give the passages side by side:—

1.	2.
'The Calvinist is often hardly dealt with in being deprived of his real standing-ground in the third and ninth chapters of the Epistle to the Romans.'—P. 366, line 14.	'The Calvinist, in fact, ignores almost the whole of the sacred volume for the sake of a few verses.'—P. 366, line 26.

[1] A fair statement of the case may be found in the Preface to the second volume of the Benedictine edition of Origen. But, did any men of ability from the Pagans, Apuleius and Plutarch, down to our own English John Bunyan, ever really leave room for such blundering? We cannot think it.

It is somewhat strange to meet with such declarations within the compass of a dozen lines. Nevertheless, we are perfectly ready to admit that there is much truth, both in the apology and in the reproof, which are here put forth. But how to reconcile passages No. 1 and No. 2 with passage No. 3 (p. 419), in which it is clearly implied that Calvin 'goes beyond the letter of that text,' wherein (in passage No. 1) his follower, the Calvinist, was admitted to have 'a real standing-ground,' utterly passes our poor comprehension: though it may not, we admit, present the slightest difficulty to thorough-paced partizans of the Hegelian system of philosophy.

Our own objection to Calvin is, as we have intimated, that of Professor Jowett's second passage in page 366. It is *not* that Calvin has *no* countenance for his views in Holy Scripture, but that instead of comparing one set of facts with another, one class of texts with another, he insists on forcing on our attention those only which suit his system, and in expecting us to ignore all the rest. His error is not unlike that of those who cull out every verse which speaks of God's mercy, and pass by those which proclaim His justice; or of those who perceive all that teaches or implies that our Saviour is man, and omit those which teach or imply that He is God. But, meanwhile, the truth remains unshaken, however far removed we may be in this life from comprehending its consistency—God does foresee and overrule all things, and yet man remains a free agent; He is the All-merciful, and yet, at the same time, the All-just; Christ is perfect and glorified man, and yet ever was, and is, and is to be, Very and Eternal GOD.

Before we quit this branch of our subject, we must call attention to a prediction of Mr. Jowett which bears upon it. [The italics are his.]

'The time will come when educated men will no more be able to believe that the words, "out of Egypt have I called my son" (Matt. ii. 15; Hosea xi. 1) were *intended* by the prophet to refer to the return of Joseph and Mary from Egypt, than they are now able to believe the Roman Catholic explanation of Gen. iii. 15. "Ipsa conteret caput tuum."'—P. 418.

It is very difficult for 'educated men,' or indeed for any class of men, to cease to believe in a position which they have never held. It may arise from our own ignorance, but we are at present utterly unconscious of the place where, or the time when, the 'educated men' referred to may have existed. Commentators on Holy Scripture are, in such a case, the natural objects of our thoughts. Now we venture to say, that neither S. Chrysostom, S. Jerome, Bishop Lowth, Thomas Scott, Maldonatus, Dean Alford, Dr. Pusey, Cornelius à Lapide, Mr. Burgon, Canon Wordsworth (and it would be as easy to name

more, as it would be difficult to name more variously trained interpreters), give any hint or trace of such a belief as Professor Jowett calls upon 'educated men' to resign. What will be gathered from their writings is briefly this: That the prophet Hosea, being divinely inspired, wrote words which he supposed to be only applicable to God's adopted Son, the chosen nation (cf. Exodus iv. 22); that the Evangelist, being divinely inspired, was led to see in those words a truer and loftier fulfilment in the return from Egypt of Him who is God's Son, not by adoption in time, but by nature from eternity.

If the persons to whom Mr. Jowett alludes do exist, or have existed, let them be named, and we (supported by such divines as we have mentioned) shall be perfectly ready to argue against them. But, if they cannot be produced, then we trust that it is not uncourteous to remark, that the gentlemen, whom the Greek Professor examines in logic, will be able to produce from his essay, a specimen not only of the fallacy known as a *petitio principii*, (in respect of the prophecy relating to Cyrus,) but likewise, from the passage last quoted, a good example of an *ignoratio elenchi*.

IV. Our time and space are failing us, and brief and meagre must in consequence be our treatment of the next of our topics. Although fully aware that we are transgressing the laws of literary composition, we are so anxious to avoid even the appearance of speaking, as it were, *ex cathedrâ*, so glad to obtain the sanction of higher authority than our own, that we shall commence the present section upon the Bible, as *a book which treats of human nature as a fallen nature*, by some brief extracts from one of the most temperate and philosophic statements of the case, with which we happen to be acquainted.

'There are three principal sources from which we may seek 'instruction on the condition of our fallen nature. The first of 'these is Holy Scripture. We have here, indeed, no systematic 'information on the subject; we have, it will be found on ex- 'amination, remarkably few texts which bear *directly* upon it; 'but we have, what is much more important, a definite *tone* with 'regard to it. The Bible abounds in general statements of the 'corruption of man. Many of these may be explained, it is 'true, with considerable probability, as referring to particular 'times or particular nations. But this matters little. If the 'corruption was so universal in the time of the flood, and when 'David composed the Psalms, or when S. Paul wrote the Epistle 'to the Romans, this may suffice for our guidance. Examples 'from such distant quarters amount to something like a valid 'induction. . . . . .

'The truth, then, which guards in one direction against grievous

'error with regard to human nature, is this—*we can do no 'good without the grace of God.* The event of the Pelagian 'controversy, though it has not left behind it any definite 'formula resembling the Creeds, has written this truth very 'legibly in the history of the Church, and confirmed, so as to 'leave no reasonable ground of dispute, the most natural and 'obvious interpretation of the language of the Holy Scripture 'with regard to the corruption of man.'[1]

Mr. Jowett's objections to the doctrine of original sin are twofold. *Firstly*, he appears to maintain in his work on certain Epistles of S. Paul (vol. ii., p. 167), that it is 'a doctrine at variance with our first notions of the moral nature of God;' and *secondly*, in the present essay, that it depends 'on two figurative expressions, (1 Cor. xv. 22; Romans v. 12,) to which there is no parallel in any other part of Scripture.' Let us, as briefly as possible, consider these objections separately.

We are unable to see any objection to this doctrine which does not strike equally at the root of pure Theism. Does hereditary disease, does hereditary insanity exist in the world? Do we see an infant, as yet guiltless of actual sin, suffering pains, which medical science attributes to the sin of parents? Does pride, does hot temper, never run in families? Why not, then, in the great human family, the infection of original sin?

But the expressions of S. Paul do by no means stand alone. Not only for example is David's confession, 'In sin did my mother conceive me,' (Psalm li. 5; cf. Job xiv. 4; Ephes. ii. 3,) strictly parallel, but there is a prevailing tone respecting both the evil, and the need and mode of remedy, which has deeply impressed itself upon the mind of Christendom. If Calvin and his followers, in their one-sided zeal, have over-stated the depth of that fall; nay, if S. Augustine, in his opposition to Pelagius, was in anywise tempted into excess in respect of the good acts of the heathen, and some kindred topics, this does not militate against the general position, nor induce us to believe that S. Paul's language is merely figurative. Nor is the impression of which we speak confined to those who look upon the Bible with the same eyes that we do. Without professing to see everything in its pages which is indicated by *the Westminster Reviewers*, we most completely coincide with them when they say to the authors of 'Essays and Reviews:' 'We certainly do 'think that the Gospels assert a miraculous incarnation, resur- 'rection, and ascension; and that the Epistles teach original sin 'and a vicarious sacrifice. If this be doubted by our authors,

[1] Lectures on the Study of Theology. By the Rev. C. P. Chretien, Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford. (Pp. 45—49.) We need hardly say that Mr. Chretien is in no wise responsible for our subsequent remarks on this topic.

'it is sufficient for us to say that such is the impression they 'have created on all ages of Christians.'[1]

Yes, it *is* the impression. In denying (to take the present instance) that the language of the Apostle touching original sin is figurative, in asserting that it is literally true, Augsburg and Lambeth, Trent and Geneva, are thoroughly and entirely at one. The evidence collected by the Roman Catholic M. Nicolas, the admirable psychological study of the Protestant statesman and philosopher, M. Guizot, fully harmonize with the teaching of Mr. Chretien, which has just been quoted, or with the comments of Bishop Beveridge on the ninth Article of the English Church. 'Beveridge on the Articles,' or M. Guizot's 'Leçon' (which we commend to the earnest consideration of students), are easily accessible. But the excellent chapter of M. Nicolas[2] is less known, and we shall proceed to make free use of its contents. For, once for all, be it avowed, that in opposing doctrines (or rather the denial of doctrines) of this nature, we shall never debar ourselves from the appliance of such aid as this. Calmet, and Fenelon, and Pascal, are in such matters welcome allies as well as Julius Müller or Hengstenberg; the chapters of 'Etudes Philosophiques' (*at least*, three-fifths of the whole number) which go to establish the basis of the faith yet held in common, shall have from us their just weight and their just praise; the elder Windischmann (in whom an enunciation of anything distinctively Roman seems extremely rare) shall be listened to (at the very least) as much as the Voltairian M. Pauthier, on the religions of China and Hindostan; and above all shall we avail ourselves, if necessary, of that most masterly, comprehensive, and truly Catholic volume, which has won in Germany the eulogy and gratitude of numbers of pious Lutherans, no less than of his co-religionists, the 'Heidenthum und Judenthum' of Dr. Döllinger. Let who will complain of our conduct in this respect, it must not be the authors of 'Essays and Reviews,' for they appeal to Roman authors whenever their case seems at all likely to be strengthened thereby. Far be it from us to grudge them a licence which we claim for ourselves, provided only that they will condescend to give chapter and verse, so that we may be able to test the fairness of their appeals.[3]

---

[1] Civilisation en France. (Cinquième Leçon.) Dr. Arnold expressed his admiration of this chapter. There is now an English translation of the entire work.

[2] Etudes Philosophiques sur le Christianisme. Livre II. chap. iv. (Septième edit. Paris, Vaton.

[3] We leave it to others to judge whether, for example, Mr. Wilson's representation of Petau's teaching is just. To us it seems likely to give an incorrect impression. 'It

But to return to the doctrine of the fall. 'The belief that 'man is fallen and degenerate is found among all ancient races. '*Aurea prima sata est ætas* is the motto of every nation.' This is not the language of a believer; it is from Voltaire's *Essai sur les Mœurs*. The doctrine of the hereditary transmission of sin is found stated with much precision, as an ancient tradition prior to Christianity, in a passage by the Rabbi Menalhhem. Those who accuse the great Apostle of the Gentiles of following 'rabbinical fancies' will, of course, maintain that they have here an exemplification of the truth of their charge. Those who, with us, regard him as divinely shielded from teaching error, will see a proof that he was not engaged in laying down a novel tenet in the words '*As in Adam all die*,' but simply led to give an authoritative sanction to what had been already current among his Jewish brethren.

Let the legends of Prometheus and of Pandora, especially as given by Hesiod, be considered in connexion with this subject; or again, the words of Cicero, in his 'Hortensius,' where he speaks of sages, '*qui nos ob aliqua scelera suscepta in vitâ superiore, pœnarum luendarum causâ natos esse dixerunt.*' (Similar expressions had been employed by Plato and the Pythagorean Philolaus.) 'These men,' observes Cicero, 'seem to have had some just perception (*aliquid vidisse videantur*); and *that*,' he continues, '*may be true* which we find in Aristotle, that we are 'punished, like those of yore, who fell into the hands of Etruscan 'robbers, and were slain with elaborate cruelty; their live bodies 'being tightly bound with corpses placed in all respects exactly 'opposite; *that thus are our souls linked with our bodies, as the 'living in conjunction with the dead.*'[1] (Cf. Romans vii. 21—24.)

Lastly, leaving these citations of M. Nicolas, let the thoughtful student again reflect that, though there may be but few *fully explicit* verses on this doctrine, (as venture on that of the Holy

'It is admitted, even maintained by the learned Jesuit Petavius, and many others, that the doctrine afterwards developed into the Nicene and Athanasian, is not to be found explicitly in the earliest Fathers, *nor even in Scripture*, although provable by it.'—*Essays and Reviews*, p. 160.

'Traditione, quæ dupliciter valet, aut ad eorum, quæ nullo modo scripta sunt, conservandam ac propagandam memoriam, *aut ad scriptorum explanandam sententiam* ..... Cum igitur traditio, uti superiùs ostensum est, aut ipsam sine scripto Christiani dogmatis, ut sic loquar, substantiam derivet: aut ejus è Scripturis exculpendi intelligendique modum doceat, *posteriori hâc vîâ Trinitatis est propagata confessio.*'—Petavius, Theol. Dogm. tom. II. Præfat. cap. i. § iii. viii.

[1] It is worth remembering that this treatise, the 'Hortensius,' of which we only possess fragments, was a most influential instrument in leading S. Augustine to the faith of Christ.

Trinity, it is constantly *implied;* and that, consequently, the Scriptures (as the Westminster Reviewers phrase it) 'are responsible for the ideas;' that is to say, at least for their religious sanction. How can such a passage as Hebrews ii. 14, 15, have any meaning apart from this doctrine? And a similar query may well be put with reference to numberless other texts, and whole portions of the Christian scheme of redemption.

V. The fifth of the characteristics of which we have proposed to treat, in reality involves the consideration of the profound and important question—*Is dogmatic theology possible?* To this inquiry, all our essayists (excepting Mr. Pattison and Mr. Godwin) seem to make but one reply—'*No; it is not possible!*'

This topic has often been handled, more or less, *ex professo*, in the *Christian Remembrancer;* once, at great length, in June, 1855, in an article headed *Dogmatic Theology.* It may be questioned whether a reviewer can ever refer to the periodicals in which he is writing as an independent authority: in the present instance, he certainly cannot. Yet we may own to a certain satisfaction in being able to refer to anything which may serve to relieve the discussion of its personal aspect; and the paper in question is so long prior in date to the work now before us that its reasonings cannot be accused of being aimed at any of 'the seven.' It may be ascribed to the mere force of prejudice, but it is at least no mark of inconsistency to say, that to those reasonings we still adhere, and that nothing in this volume seems to call upon us to change, or even modify, a single sentiment.

But having had occasion to express our dissent from the one-sided use of Scripture by the disciples of Calvin, as regards the attributes of the Divine sovereignty, let us here acknowledge our thorough appreciation of their firmness and keen-sightedness in respect of dogma in the abstract. It was with much gratification that we read, in a Scotch newspaper, some remarks of Principal Cunningham, on the occasion of opening a college in Edinburgh.[1] Very just and admirable, too, are the following

[1] The Free Church College was opened on Tuesday by an address from the Rev. Principal Cunningham. The learned Principal's address was chiefly devoted to a warning against one-sidedness as leading to error in the formation of opinions, especially as this tendency was exhibited in certain opinions or maxims which are prevalent in the present day, and which, erroneous or unsound in themselves because of their one-sidedness, were fitted to exert an injurious influence on the prosecution of theological studies. These opinions were—first, that Christianity was not a doctrine, but a life; and, secondly, that the proper object of all true faith is not a proposition, but a person. These opinions, which seemed to be exerting a considerable influence at the present day, the learned Principal maintained were to be regarded rather as one-sided and very partial and defective than as altogether false—the truth being that *Christianity is both a doctrine and a life, and that it is only by means of propositions, rightly formed, used, and applied, that men can know anything about Christ.*—*Scotsman* (*in Glasgow Daily Herald*, for November 10, 1859).

observations of an eminent Presbyterian layman. 'There may 'be very little spiritual religion in connexion with the purest 'system of belief. This is true of the individual, and also of the 'body. So, on the other hand, great depth and earnestness of 'devotion may be found under corrupted creeds. Thank God, 'there are wild flowers on every spot of Christian ground. *But it 'would be strange to believe in the fact of revelation, yet think it 'indifferent whether that revelation be rightly understood or not.* 'Intellectual apprehension is of no value as superseding, but of 'immense value as educating, the religious affections.' [1]

We might re-quote whole pages from this review to a like effect. But we have no right to inflict such repetition on our readers. Nor indeed is it necessary. The teaching which we have always striven to enforce, that religion without dogma must ere long become a shadow and a fiction, has been recently proclaimed anew with extraordinary vigour and precision from a most unexpected quarter.

'Via prima salutis
Quod minimè reris, Graiâ pandetur ab urbe.'

It is from the *Westminster Review* that we hear the utter repudiation of the notion that Christianity can exist apart from dogmatism. Of the system proposed by Mr. Jowett and his friends, it says,—

'It hopes to mitigate the evil by thrusting the intellectual behind the moral element of the belief. The doctrine it leaves as possibly erroneous and comparatively unimportant; it sums up the Gospels in the practice of the Christian life. This is a wide-spread and very attractive modification, but it is one in which most faiths have eventually terminated. . . . .

'It seems strange in the present day to be insisting that religious societies must be held together by common opinions, convictions, and schemes of belief, and not by common feelings or practices. Every religion which ever flourished did so by the strength of a body of doctrine, and a system of definite axioms. Nothing else could give unity and permanence to its teaching. No collection of maxims on rules of life can last very long when deprived of dogmatic basis and common intellectual assent. The whole teaching and influence of every religion has rested ultimately and entirely on cardinal propositions universally received as true. . . .

'Nothing but such a basis can satisfy the mind of the inquirer, or give coherence to the social body. Moral principles have been found to lead to strife when made the foundation of communities. They cannot be preserved from distortion through every character which receives them, and put no check on intellectual superstructures which utterly overwhelm them. Endless attempts have been made towards union in an ideal life. They have ended invariably in chimera and confusion. . . .

'In this last essay [Mr. Jowett's], at least there is a deliberate attempt to admit the doctrine as uncertain and transitory, and to bind together the faithful by the imitation of one great ideal. Creeds are discredited as accidental and variable, principles as essential and eternal. The moment one cardinal

[1] Essay on the Ecclesiastical History of Scotland. By the Duke of Argyll. P. 285. (Second Edition.)

dogma is surrendered as uncertain, or even as provisional, the whole intellectual framework gives way. All the repose, the unity, all the permanence which rest upon undoubted truths, are gone. The unguided feelings, the variety and fluctuation of moral conceptions, take their place in endless agitation and discord.' [1]

We trust that the English Church has not resigned, and will not resign, one dogma that is really cardinal.

And now to turn to the particular theme before us, the Mystery of the Holy Incarnation; that dogma proclaimed with such wondrous conciseness in the Gospel of the loved disciple: 'the Word was God . . . and the Word was made flesh.'

It is little, indeed, that we can at present find room to say concerning this central truth of Christianity. We must not stop to dwell upon the many dim adumbrations of it in Egypt, or China, or India, or in classic systems of mythology. These may be read of in many able and excellent works; as for instance, in the second volume of Mr. Gladstone's 'Homer and the Homeric Age.' Yet let us say one word on the marvellous fitness of this stupendous truth to supply precisely that which is lacking in the most active and energetic of the creeds that stand in rivalry to the faith of the Cross. Take Mahometanism, take Buddhism. The Mahometan is right in proclaiming that God is One, right in protesting against all idolatry. But in so doing, he leaves all the interval between God and man bare and lonely; he leaves a void which the Incarnation alone fills up, without robbing him of the real truths which he rightly holds. The Buddhist is right in believing that in Him who made us, we live and move and have our being; he is right in yearning for a closer union with that great and eternal Being, the only self-existent substance. But he is wrong in imagining that aught created can be, or become, of one substance with the Creator; he is wrong in looking for an union that shall destroy his personality, wrong in denying the personality of God. Through the conjunction of the two natures in one person, man may indeed attain to union with his Maker in a way which, if it sound more humble, is as infinitely holier and happier than the dreams of the Buddhist doctrine of Nirvana, as the pure truth of the one transcends the distorted lineaments of the other.

And as the Incarnation, on the one hand, reveals to the Gentiles around that 'something' which, without it, they desiderate in vain, so, too, on the other hand, does it still form a bond of connexion between thousands of Christians who, on other points, remain at variance. It is, indeed, one thing to accept this doctrine in words, another to realize anything of its depth and

[1] *Westminster Review*, No. XXXVI. Oct. 1860. *Art.* Neo-Christianity.—Our former quotation from the *Westminster Review* came from this article, and we shall return to it presently.

fulness, to bring it home to one's heart and conscience. Great, indeed, is the satisfaction that we feel whenever we can trace evidence of such a realization, whether in the works of Divines of *any* community of those who 'profess and call themselves Christians;' or still more, perhaps, because it comes upon us the more unexpectedly, in the fields of literature or art. Therefore do we read with peculiar joy such passages as that beautiful one in Hugh Miller's 'My Schools and Schoolmasters,' wherein he describes his turning to that Person who had not hitherto, in his case, occupied the rightful place in a believer's heart; therefore do we hail with gratitude the appearance of so many passages in the poems of Robert and of Elizabeth Browning; therefore are we most glad to see, in a widely-circulated magazine, such poetry as that of the late Professor George Wilson, and that (of unknown authorship to us) which bears the signature of 'Orwell.' Even attacks upon much that we hold dear lose one-half of their sting, whenever we think that we can discern amidst the storm the golden light of that bright Truth irradiating the darkness of the clouds.

There are numberless questions concerning religion on which the mass of believers may not care to seek for any immediate and definite reply. But this is not one of them. Not from the influence of any of its innate faults, but from a kind of moral and religious compulsion, the mind imperatively demands an answer to such queries as these:—'Is that Great Teacher my Creator, or only a creature?' 'If He is my Creator, are there, then, two Gods?'

Many answers of a positive and definite kind *are* given. Strauss replies: 'He is at best a mere man, and probably never existed 'at all.' Judaism replies: 'He lived and died—an impostor.' Socinianism replies: 'He taught a purer morality than any of his 'fellow-men, but being only a man, in no other way does He save 'us.' Mahomet replies: 'He was a true prophet, miraculously 'conceived, but is, nevertheless, only man, and *my* inferior.' Arius and the Semi-Arians reply—we really know not what, so vague, hollow, and uncertain is the sound; so hopelessly and utterly untenable for any great lapse of ages by any large multitudes of men. Napoleon, at Saint Helena, is *said* to have replied (and if the words are *not* his, still the argument involved holds good): 'There is no God in heaven, if a mere man has been 'able to conceive and execute with full success the gigantic de-'sign of securing for himself supreme worship by usurping the 'name of God. Jesus Christ is the only one who has dared this.'[1]

[1] The document from which this extract is given is from the communications of General Montholon. A translation and brief comment may be found in a Scotch publication, the *Gospel Messenger* for June, 1857. The original French is given by M. Nicolas, at the commencement of his fourth volume of *Etudes*.

The replies which are the furthest removed from this last clear and consistent one gain in consistency, as, alas! they increase in blasphemy. It is simpler and easier to represent that Life as purely mythical than to face the problems which follow if its reality be once conceded, simpler; with the Jew, to allege imposture than, with the Unitarian, to praise the morality of One who must seem to insinuate awful claims which had not the faintest foundation in truth. And where the rare event of a cultivated Moslem's conversion to Christianity has taken place, it seems to have originated mainly in this circumstance, that the Koran and its commentators grant too much, or else too little, to *Issa Ben Mariam;* too much if, being a subordinate prophet, He was yet miraculously conceived, and will return to judge Degial (*i.e.* Antichrist) at the consummation of all things; too little, if all this be true, and yet, after granting it, we are still to believe that Mahomet is above Him. Of the inconsistencies of Arians and semi-Arians we need not at present say any more.

There is an answer contained in an ancient document which differs from these last-named shifting theories. That document shall be characterised, not in any language of ours, but in that of an eminent Nonconformist man of letters, who is among the very last to yield undue obedience to Church authority :—

'Not one of those schemes of biblical belief which, in the lapse of time has disputed the ground with the Nicene faith, recommends itself by that charm of interior congruity which this latter so conspicuously possesses. It is this alone that is an entire belief, and concerning which it may be affirmed that its elements—abstract, moral, and spiritual—are in unison. In this Belief there is proportion and symmetry, and that grandeur and simplicity which is the inimitable characteristic of a Great Truth in any department. With this Belief at my heart, the logical ground of the historic evidences is firm to the foot; without it, while attempting to give coherence to the body of proof, I tread a shifting sandbank. Without it, the supernatural narratives of the Gospels stand out as unsustained, and as disproportioned to the doctrine, and I am fain to rid myself of them, if possible: with it, the miracles of Christ's public life take their places of fitness as the graceful accompaniments of the ministry of Him who "dwelt among us" for effecting a purpose far greater than all miracles, and more arduous than the uttering the creative fiat.'[1]

It is with real regret that we turn from the language of this eloquent lay-Dissenter to that of the priest of our own communion. Professor Jowett is indeed in this matter, as in so many others, far above the majority of his colleagues; above (we are inclined to think) even his friend who presides at Rugby. He admits (p. 353)—and it is a vast admission—that '*the creeds are acknowledged to be a part of Christianity*,' and that 'their

[1] Isaac Taylor. 'Restoration of Belief.'

'technical expressions have sunk deep into the heart of the human race.' Nevertheless, he cannot allow that 'they should be pressed into the service of the interpreter.'—*Ibid.*

The precise relation of the Creeds to Holy Scripture is, without doubt, one of the profoundest questions that can occupy the human mind. We have discussed it (how imperfectly and unworthily we are only too conscious) in the article already referred to, on *Dogmatic Theology*. At present our observations must be brief.

No intelligent student of the New Testament ever came to its perusal with his mind like a perfect *tabula rasa*. Its earliest readers certainly did not. At least five years elapsed between the Ascension and the appearance of the first book of the New Canon. During this interval Apostles and Evangelists taught orally. Theophilus is to read S. Luke's Gospel, not as an announcement of previously unheard-of news, but that he may know the certainty of those things wherein he has been instructed. To intimate, as is done by Mr. Jowett (p. 353), that at this period 'the *whole* of Christianity was contained in the words, 'Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou mayest be saved,' is simply meaningless, if, as seems probable, we are invited to suppose that it was left an open and indifferent question *in what sense they were to believe*. In that miserable eighteenth century, to which the Professor of Greek and his allies would in so many respects fain drag us back, when 'dogmatic theology had ceased to exist,' as Mr. Pattison (p. 259) most truly remarks—in that century, a prelate is said to have declared that 'the Church of 'England embraced in her fold every man who believed in the 'divine mission of Christ.' 'Truly a most comprehensive definition,' was the just and forcible comment of a continental critic—'a most comprehensive definition, seeing that it includes the whole of the Mahometan world.' It will require powers of persuasion far greater than even those of Mr. Jowett, to convince either us or those who agree with us on the one hand, or the *Westminster Reviewers* on the other, that the word '*believe*' among the primitive converts to Christianity involved nothing more than some such elastic profession as this.

But *if* it involved something more, what was, it must be asked, that something? We assert that it was implicitly that which our Church in her Catechism teaches the children whom God has entrusted to her care; that it was, essentially, what S. Athanasius taught, though we fully grant that Gnostics and Ebionites, Arians and Anomœans, had partly for evil, yet still more perhaps for good, necessitated a more technical, a less fresh and childlike, form of confession. For evil—for it were a blessed thing to remain, if possible, for ever in the unsuspecting

The replies which are the furthest removed from this last clear and consistent one gain in consistency, as, alas! they increase in blasphemy. It is simpler and easier to represent that Life as purely mythical than to face the problems which follow if its reality be once conceded, simpler; with the Jew, to allege imposture than, with the Unitarian, to praise the morality of One who must seem to insinuate awful claims which had not the faintest foundation in truth. And where the rare event of a cultivated Moslem's conversion to Christianity has taken place, it seems to have originated mainly in this circumstance, that the Koran and its commentators grant too much, or else too little, to *Issa Ben Mariam;* too much if, being a subordinate prophet, He was yet miraculously conceived, and will return to judge Degial (*i.e.* Antichrist) at the consummation of all things; too little, if all this be true, and yet, after granting it, we are still to believe that Mahomet is above Him. Of the inconsistencies of Arians and semi-Arians we need not at present say any more.

There is an answer contained in an ancient document which differs from these last-named shifting theories. That document shall be characterised, not in any language of ours, but in that of an eminent Nonconformist man of letters, who is among the very last to yield undue obedience to Church authority:—

'Not one of those schemes of biblical belief which, in the lapse of time has disputed the ground with the Nicene faith, recommends itself by that charm of interior congruity which this latter so conspicuously possesses. It is this alone that is an entire belief, and concerning which it may be affirmed that its elements—abstract, moral, and spiritual—are in unison. In this Belief there is proportion and symmetry, and that grandeur and simplicity which is the inimitable characteristic of a Great Truth in any department. With this Belief at my heart, the logical ground of the historic evidences is firm to the foot; without it, while attempting to give coherence to the body of proof, I tread a shifting sandbank. Without it, the supernatural narratives of the Gospels stand out as unsustained, and as disproportioned to the doctrine, and I am fain to rid myself of them, if possible: with it, the miracles of Christ's public life take their places of fitness as the graceful accompaniments of the ministry of Him who "dwelt among us" for effecting a purpose far greater than all miracles, and more arduous than the uttering the creative fiat.'[1]

It is with real regret that we turn from the language of this eloquent lay-Dissenter to that of the priest of our own communion. Professor Jowett is indeed in this matter, as in so many others, far above the majority of his colleagues; above (we are inclined to think) even his friend who presides at Rugby. He admits (p. 353)—and it is a vast admission—that '*the creeds are acknowledged to be a part of Christianity,*' and that 'their

[1] Isaac Taylor. 'Restoration of Belief.'

'technical expressions have sunk deep into the heart of the human race.' Nevertheless, he cannot allow that 'they should be pressed into the service of the interpreter.'—*Ibid.*

The precise relation of the Creeds to Holy Scripture is, without doubt, one of the profoundest questions that can occupy the human mind. We have discussed it (how imperfectly and unworthily we are only too conscious) in the article already referred to, on *Dogmatic Theology*. At present our observations must be brief.

No intelligent student of the New Testament ever came to its perusal with his mind like a perfect *tabula rasa*. Its earliest readers certainly did not. At least five years elapsed between the Ascension and the appearance of the first book of the New Canon. During this interval Apostles and Evangelists taught orally. Theophilus is to read S. Luke's Gospel, not as an announcement of previously unheard-of news, but that he may know the certainty of those things wherein he has been instructed. To intimate, as is done by Mr. Jowett (p. 353), that at this period 'the *whole* of Christianity was contained in the words, 'Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou mayest be saved,' is simply meaningless, if, as seems probable, we are invited to suppose that it was left an open and indifferent question *in what sense they were to believe*. In that miserable eighteenth century, to which the Professor of Greek and his allies would in so many respects fain drag us back, when 'dogmatic theology had ceased to exist,' as Mr. Pattison (p. 259) most truly remarks—in that century, a prelate is said to have declared that 'the Church of 'England embraced in her fold every man who believed in the 'divine mission of Christ.' 'Truly a most comprehensive definition,' was the just and forcible comment of a continental critic—'a most comprehensive definition, seeing that it includes the whole of the Mahometan world.' It will require powers of persuasion far greater than even those of Mr. Jowett, to convince either us or those who agree with us on the one hand, or the *Westminster Reviewers* on the other, that the word '*believe*' among the primitive converts to Christianity involved nothing more than some such elastic profession as this.

But *if* it involved something more, what was, it must be asked, that something? We assert that it was implicitly that which our Church in her Catechism teaches the children whom God has entrusted to her care; that it was, essentially, what S. Athanasius taught, though we fully grant that Gnostics and Ebionites, Arians and Anomœans, had partly for evil, yet still more perhaps for good, necessitated a more technical, a less fresh and childlike, form of confession. For evil—for it were a blessed thing to remain, if possible, for ever in the unsuspecting

The replies which are the furthest removed from this last clear and consistent one gain in consistency, as, alas! they increase in blasphemy. It is simpler and easier to represent that Life as purely mythical than to face the problems which follow if its reality be once conceded, simpler; with the Jew, to allege imposture than, with the Unitarian, to praise the morality of One who must seem to insinuate awful claims which had not the faintest foundation in truth. And where the rare event of a cultivated Moslem's conversion to Christianity has taken place, it seems to have originated mainly in this circumstance, that the Koran and its commentators grant too much, or else too little, to *Issa Ben Mariam;* too much if, being a subordinate prophet, He was yet miraculously conceived, and will return to judge Degial (*i.e.* Antichrist) at the consummation of all things; too little, if all this be true, and yet, after granting it, we are still to believe that Mahomet is above Him. Of the inconsistencies of Arians and semi-Arians we need not at present say any more.

There is an answer contained in an ancient document which differs from these last-named shifting theories. That document shall be characterised, not in any language of ours, but in that of an eminent Nonconformist man of letters, who is among the very last to yield undue obedience to Church authority:—

'Not one of those schemes of biblical belief which, in the lapse of time has disputed the ground with the Nicene faith, recommends itself by that charm of interior congruity which this latter so conspicuously possesses. It is this alone that is an entire belief, and concerning which it may be affirmed that its elements—abstract, moral, and spiritual—are in unison. In this Belief there is proportion and symmetry, and that grandeur and simplicity which is the inimitable characteristic of a Great Truth in any department. With this Belief at my heart, the logical ground of the historic evidences is firm to the foot; without it, while attempting to give coherence to the body of proof, I tread a shifting sandbank. Without it, the supernatural narratives of the Gospels stand out as unsustained, and as disproportioned to the doctrine, and I am fain to rid myself of them, if possible: with it, the miracles of Christ's public life take their places of fitness as the graceful accompaniments of the ministry of Him who "dwelt among us" for effecting a purpose far greater than all miracles, and more arduous than the uttering the creative fiat.'[1]

It is with real regret that we turn from the language of this eloquent lay-Dissenter to that of the priest of our own communion. Professor Jowett is indeed in this matter, as in so many others, far above the majority of his colleagues; above (we are inclined to think) even his friend who presides at Rugby. He admits (p. 353)—and it is a vast admission—that '*the creeds are acknowledged to be a part of Christianity*,' and that 'their

[1] Isaac Taylor. 'Restoration of Belief.'

'technical expressions have sunk deep into the heart of the human race.' Nevertheless, he cannot allow that 'they should be pressed into the service of the interpreter.'—*Ibid.*

The precise relation of the Creeds to Holy Scripture is, without doubt, one of the profoundest questions that can occupy the human mind. We have discussed it (how imperfectly and unworthily we are only too conscious) in the article already referred to, on *Dogmatic Theology*. At present our observations must be brief.

No intelligent student of the New Testament ever came to its perusal with his mind like a perfect *tabula rasa*. Its earliest readers certainly did not. At least five years elapsed between the Ascension and the appearance of the first book of the New Canon. During this interval Apostles and Evangelists taught orally. Theophilus is to read S. Luke's Gospel, not as an announcement of previously unheard-of news, but that he may know the certainty of those things wherein he has been instructed. To intimate, as is done by Mr. Jowett (p. 353), that at this period 'the *whole* of Christianity was contained in the words, 'Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou mayest be saved,' is simply meaningless, if, as seems probable, we are invited to suppose that it was left an open and indifferent question *in what sense they were to believe*. In that miserable eighteenth century, to which the Professor of Greek and his allies would in so many respects fain drag us back, when 'dogmatic theology had ceased to exist,' as Mr. Pattison (p. 259) most truly remarks—in that century, a prelate is said to have declared that 'the Church of 'England embraced in her fold every man who believed in the 'divine mission of Christ.' 'Truly a most comprehensive definition,' was the just and forcible comment of a continental critic—'a most comprehensive definition, seeing that it includes the whole of the Mahometan world.' It will require powers of persuasion far greater than even those of Mr. Jowett, to convince either us or those who agree with us on the one hand, or the *Westminster Reviewers* on the other, that the word '*believe*' among the primitive converts to Christianity involved nothing more than some such elastic profession as this.

But *if* it involved something more, what was, it must be asked, that something? We assert that it was implicitly that which our Church in her Catechism teaches the children whom God has entrusted to her care; that it was, essentially, what S. Athanasius taught, though we fully grant that Gnostics and Ebionites, Arians and Anomœans, had partly for evil, yet still more perhaps for good, necessitated a more technical, a less fresh and childlike, form of confession. For evil—for it were a blessed thing to remain, if possible, for ever in the unsuspecting

innocence of childhood; yet more for good (as Evagrius and S. Augustine well observe[1]), because the collective no less than the individual child must grow to manhood, must learn caution and wisdom, must see what evil is, must win through the struggle the prize of victory. And God, who maketh all things work together for good to them that love Him, shall overrule such losses to final good. Yes! though our first parents forfeit Paradise through sin, the reparation brings far more than any earthly Eden; and loftier shall be the bliss of the redeemed in Heaven than any that was in store for them, if no Fall had ever taken place. The crown that has no cross before it is *not* the highest for created beings. Not in the robe of those angelic hosts which have ever stood upright, but in the garb of that humanity which fell is HE clad, before whom men and angels alike in adoration bow, who is one with the Father and the Holy Ghost, God blessed for evermore.

Therefore we do not mourn, because the Church of the fourth or the thirteenth, of the sixteenth or the nineteenth, century cannot possibly be in *all* respects like the assemblage of the primitive believers. If we have lost much, very much, we have yet gained something. There *is* a sense in which (as Dean Trench and others have rightly said) it may be lawfully asserted, that the Church, like her Lord when on earth, increases in wisdom and in stature. And having learnt by dire experience the danger of certain kinds of error, she has the more reason to cherish with firmness and fidelity any form of sound words that has proved a safeguard against its sway.

But if in youth we learn catechisms, if we keep the Church's seasons, if we are able to use the suffrages of the Litany, if the Nicene Creed is still to form a part of our worship—that worship which, as Mr. Freeman and other ritualists point out, primarily depends upon the Incarnation and the abiding Priesthood of Christ—then it is simply impossible but that these symbols and prayers and festivals will all affect our interpretation of Holy Scripture. To do away with one would be but half-and-half work: a thorough destructive must, for very consistency's sake, abolish Good Friday and Easter, Christmas and Pentecost; for their teaching, as they stand in the Prayer-book, and are kept in Churches, is not less definite, and probably not less influential, than that of the Creeds themselves.

Suppose, for argument's sake, that this change were effected. The mind will not any more than before be a *tabula rasa*. 'We 'cannot'—justly remarks Neander, in the Introduction to his 'Life of Christ,'—'we cannot entirely free ourselves from pre-

[1] Evagrius, Hist. Eccles. lib. i. cap. 11; S. Aug. de Civ. Dei, xvi. cap. 2, *et alibi*.

'suppositions; they control our consciousness, whether we will 'or no, and the supposed freedom from them is, in fact, nothing 'else but the exchange of one set for another.' Yes! it is even so; and there are quarters where the tendency seems to be to substitute for the time-honoured and hallowing influence of catechisms, and creeds, and liturgies, as an aid in their due and proper place to the right understanding of Scripture, a course of study in the writings of Fichte, Hegel, and Jacobi.

But we do not wish to insinuate that Professor Jowett is prepared to go to such lengths as this; and it is only fair to listen to some of his own words. He says in page 354:—

'If the occurrence of the phraseology of the Nicene age in a verse of the Epistles would detect the spuriousness of the verse in which it was found, how can the Nicene or Athanasian Creed be a suitable instrument for the interpretation of Scripture? . . . . . Absorbed as S. Paul was in the person of Christ with an intensity of faith and love of which, in modern days, and at this distance of time, we can scarcely form a conception—high as he raised the dignity of his Lord above all things in Heaven and earth—looking to Him as the Creator of all things, and the head of quick and dead; he does not speak of Him as "equal to the Father," or "of one substance with the Father."'

We have here an alleged fact, that none of these expressions are in Scripture, or, at least, not in the writings of S. Paul; an hypothesis, that their occurrence would at once prove the spuriousness of a given verse; an inference, that creeds containing them are hence proved to be unfit instruments for the interpretation of Scripture.

We believe that Mr. Jowett is wrong at every point: that his alleged fact is not a fact; that his hypothesis is untrustworthy; and, lastly, that even if his fact and hypothesis be admitted, his inference must still be pronounced to be utterly hollow and unwarrantable.

In what way a Being who is 'the Creator of all things' differs from One who is equal to the Father, it is not for us to try to explain. Nor again, why we are herein to be limited to the expressions of S. Paul alone, seeing that when Mr. Jowett wishes to confute the Socinian he has immediate recourse to the language of S. John. However, as we said at first, we follow our author's lead: and we must avow, that his representation of the Apostle's teaching does seem to us to be miserably inadequate to the truth. Let the reader weigh well, for example, the force of the inference contained in Romans xiv. 10, 11. With reverence be it said, the Apostle's inferential '*for*,' in verse 11, is simply idle, unless the Jehovah referred to is identical with the Christ of the judgment seat in verse 10.[1] (We say Jehovah, because in the

[1] If we might, without irreverence, give a partial (of necessity *only* a partial

original of Isaiah here quoted, the word is that solemn *tetragrammaton*). Precisely similar is the inference from 1 Cor. x. 9. The Israelites in the wilderness tempted Christ, because Christ is God. And, again, from Ephes. iv. 8, where the comparison with Psalm lxviii. 17, 18, clearly leads us to the same conclusion.

We further believe, with Professor Ellicott and others, that the true rendering of the expression in Titus ii. 13, is 'of our great God and Saviour.' The balance of evidence seems now also in favour of the *textus receptus* in the account of S. Paul's speech at Miletus (Acts xx. 28): and we agree with Dr. Davidson and the Five Clergymen, in retaining the received punctuation in Romans ix. 5, and not that of Lachman and Tischendorf, which is preferred by Mr. Jowett. Lastly, we must strenuously maintain that the words τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ (Philipp. ii. 6) *do* mean 'the being equal with God,' that is to say, the being 'equal to the Father,' the very phrase which Mr. Jowett denies to be in the writings of S. Paul. *Pariari Deo* is the rendering of Tertullian. If the words do not mean this, what *do* they mean? Let Mr. Jowett and those who follow him tell us plainly. Let them answer the comments of Canon Wordsworth and Professor Ellicott. Until those arguments are met, we must regard the alleged fact as simply a mistake.

But the appearance of Nicene phraseology, or Athanasian, would, says the Professor, of itself, apart from any question of testimony or evidence, be sufficient to condemn as spurious any alleged verse of Scripture in which it occurred. Are we so sure of this? Are we such good judges of the case as to be able to distinguish exactly in this matter? On this principle we believe that the entire passage last referred to (Philipp. ii. 5—11) ought to be struck out, as containing an Athanasian phrase. Let us suppose that a person, well-read in the rest of the New Testament, had been kept in ignorance of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Will any candid thinker maintain that the phrase (i. 3), 'being the brightness of His glory and the express image of His Person' (ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης καὶ χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ), is not couched in a diction almost as foreign to the rest of the Canon, as the '*Light of Light*' of the Nicene Creed, or even as the '*Consubstantial*' itself? Most remarkable is it that the actual word ὁμοούσιος (which Mr. Jowett *seems* to

---

illustration of our meaning from secular literature, we would remind the reader of the well-known passage,—

> 'Glamis hath murder'd sleep, and *therefore* Cawdor
> Shall sleep no more; Macbeth shall sleep no more.

The force of the illative particle of course depends upon the identity of Cawdor and Macbeth with Glamis.

allude to, as if it were not earlier than the date of the Nicene Council) is employed by Origen in that comment on this very passage, which has been preserved for us by the Martyr Pamphilus. '*Quæ utræque similitudines manifestissimè ostendunt* '*communionem substantiæ esse Filio cum Patre. Aporrhœa enim* '*ὁμοούσιος videtur, id est unius substantiæ cum illo corpore ex quo* '*est vel aporrhœa vel vapor.*'[1]

But, even supposing that the fact was as our author states, and that the hypothesis were really sound, the inference would still seem to us perfectly monstrous. As Mr. Bright has well suggested in an excellent note appended to his recent most valuable and seasonable volume,[2] Mr. Jowett's argument would involve the conclusion, that no comment can be satisfactory which is not conveyed in the actual phraseology of the document to be explained. The Professor of Greek has referred, in portions of his essay, to Sophocles. Are those *scholia*, of which Wunder and others have made such good use, always Sophoclean in the language of their explanations? A modern commentator on S. Paul justly remarks of such words as *ἀγάπη*, *πίστις*, *δόξα* and others, that 'in the technical language of German philosophy they are objective and subjective at once.'[3] (We waive the characteristic assignment of this distinction to Germany. Just as if it was not perfectly familiar to the schoolmen; as if even the Logic of Watts and Johnson's Dictionary had not explained the meanings of *objective* and *subjective*, before German philosophy had ever crossed that German Ocean, wherein a *quondam* Bampton Lecturer once expressed a wish that it had been engulfed). Interpretation based on this scholastic distinction is, in our judgment, perfectly legitimate; but it must necessarily introduce a great deal of phraseology which would, in *any* language, be most unlike that of the New Testament. The real question to be asked concerning a comment is, 'Does it 'overlay, or does it help us to understand more clearly, the 'meaning of the documents commented upon?' And once more, even if the Nicene phraseology conveyed to us only negative notions, are these on such a subject useless? Our reply shall be made, not in the language of a professed theologian, but of a famous German metaphysician, '*Negative notions serve to secure* '*us from error.* They are consequently unnecessary in cases 'where it is impossible for us to deceive ourselves. *They are* '*most necessary, most important, for instance, in reference to the* '*conception which we form of such a Being as God.*'[4]

[1] Tom. iv. p. 697, D. (Ed. Ben.)

[2] A History of the Church, from A.D. 313 to 451 (J. H. Parker).

[3] Jowett on the Epistles, vol. ii. p. 88.

[4] Kant's Logic. Introduction, chap. viii.—Not having the original by us, we translate from the French of M. Tissot.

We had fully intended to compare Mr. Jowett's language on this head with that of some of the great dogmatic theologians, as, *e.g.*, S. Athanasius or Bishop Pearson. Such a comparison would, no doubt, have exhibited the existence of very deep differences: differences arising in part from an utter want of sympathy on Mr. Jowett's side with such studies, but likewise in part (we must venture to think) from a lack of any intimate acquaintance with their real teaching on the part of the professor.

But since it is not in our power to accomplish such a task at present, we leave the matter with a warning from one who, if any, has indeed earned the right to a hearing. 'The strongly 'developed tendencies of our own times towards humanitarian 'conceptions of the nature and work of our divine Master, 'tendencies often associated with great depth of feeling and 'tenderness of sympathy,—seem now to demand the serious 'attention of every thoughtful man. The signs of the times are 'very noticeable. The divinity of the Eternal Son is not now 'so much assailed by avowed heretical teaching, as diluted by 'more plausible, perhaps even more excusable, but certainly no 'less destructive and pernicious developments of human error. 'The turmoil of Arian and semi-Arian strife has comparatively 'ceased, to be succeeded, however, by a more delusive calm, and 'a more dangerous and enervating repose. In the popular 'theology of the present day, the Eternal Son is presented to 'us under aspects by no means calculated to rouse any active 'hostility or provoke any earnest antagonism. All is suasive 'and seductive; our Lord is claimed as united to us by human 'affinities of touching yet precarious application; He is the 'prince of sufferers, the champion of dependence and depression, 'the representative of contested principles of social union: His 'Crucifixion becomes the apotheosis of self-denial, the Atonement 'the master work of a pure and sublimated sympathy—all prin-'ciples and aspects the more dangerous from involving admix-'tures of partial truth, the more harmful from their seeming 'harmlessness. It is against this more specious and subtle form 'of error that we have now to contend; it is this plausible and 'versatile theosophy that seeks to ensnare us by its appeal to 'our better feelings and warmer sympathies, that seems to edify 'while it perverts, that attracts while it ruins, that it is now the 'duty of every true servant of Jesus Christ to seek to expose 'and to countervail.'[1]

VI. We must virtually postpone until another time the consideration of the last in our list of characteristics of Holy Writ

[1] Professor Ellicott on Philippians, &c., pp. x. xi. (Preface.)

—that, namely, of the Bible as a book which gives a peculiar and unique idea of itself. But it cannot be left wholly untouched.

Reference has already been made to that sublime and mysterious title which S. John applies to our Lord in the opening of his Gospel. It has often been remarked by sincere Christians, and neologists seem never tired of repeating it, that this title of the Messiah was by no means new; that it was a genuine tradition of the Jews; that it occurs in the Targums of Jonathan and Onkelos, in the Chaldee Paraphrases, and in the version of the LXX, as well as in the writings of Philo.[1] Through the Evangelist, it received the stamp of a Divine authority. If, as seems not improbable, Simon Magus and his followers had begun to misuse this sacred name, and refer it to wrong objects, S. John called them to come back to the recognition of its true application, much as when his fellow-apostle said to the Athenians, 'Whom ye ignorantly worship, Him declare I unto you.'

Most profound and comprehensive is that title. It is worthy of the deep insight of Goethe (alas! that it was so cold and external in its character) that he should represent one who is athirst for hidden knowledge, as pondering over all the possible renderings of the first six words of the Gospel of S. John. Those words may probably admit of all the versions that are given in *Faust*, and it may be of even more besides.

May there not (we commend the point to the earnest consideration of students) be some deep analogy, some subtle connexion, between the Word Incarnate and the Word inspired? (It was with delight that we discovered that this supposition was not new, but dates back at least as far as the works of S. Cyril of Alexandria.) *Is there not almost invariably found on the part of those who would lower our views of the written Word, a more or less unsatisfactory enunciation of the doctrine concerning the Incarnate Word?*

One of the most calm, learned, and philosophic writers of our day, who stands (to our great regret) quite outside, we fear, the pale of Christianity in any sense, has remarked, with reference to the intolerance displayed by so many unbelievers—'When 'the historian of Jesus shall be as free in his appreciations as the 'historian of Buddha or of Mahomet, he will no longer dream of 'reviling those who think differently from himself.'[2] When—when, that is to say, a man can bring himself to criticise the words and acts of Him who is his God and Judge, in the same

[1] Schöttgen *ap.* Gladstone. Homer, &c., vol. ii. p. 52.—Wordsworth's Greek Test. *in loc. cit.*

[2] M. Ernest Renan, cited by M. Saint-René Taillandier. *Revue des deux Mondes* for 15th September, 1857. (Tome xi. p. 272.)

spirit as he comments on those of his fellow-sinners, then he can afford to be cool and collected, he can afford to gaze with indifference on the sentiments of opponents of every sort. We perfectly believe it. The *dictum* of our laureate—

'A little grain of conscience made him sour'—

is repeatedly proved true in a thousand ways. The bigotry of Voltaire, on which Gibbon was so satirical, and the fierce intolerance of Diderot, arose, we suspect, in part from the fact that they were *not* able, in their heart of hearts, to attain to that *ab extra* spirit of cold contemplation, of mental dissection, of 'One like unto the Son of Man,' which M. Ernest Renan here pourtrays.[1]

Now, we do not for a moment intend to insinuate any offensive analogy; but something of that impossibility of adopting, or wishing to adopt, these 'free appreciations' concerning the Redeemer of mankind, the Word of God, does cling likewise about our movements, if we so much as attempt to carry out the advice of Professor Jowett, and study and interpret, 'like any other book,' that volume which is likewise no less truly, though in another sense, the Word of God.

There are entire pages, in this last of the seven Essays, of the kind which we quoted at the commencement of this article. Sure we are that their author never would or could have written them with reference to any other book. With his statement in page 337 of the points in common with other books, we have no serious ground of difference; yet it must be evident that if the principles for which we have been contending are sound, a different hue will colour the pages of the Bible, and extend, in some measure, even to our uses of subsidiary aids. We may rightly regard the Incarnate Word as our elder brother; yet inquiries about Him, even respecting those points of human nature which He has condescended to share with us, are affected by His Divinity in a manner much more easy to feel than to describe.

The Written Word embodies, we maintain, a Divine and a human element; herein preserving, in some faint measure, that resemblance to the Eternal Son made man, of which we have just been speaking. It is perfectly possible that English divines of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries may have paid too exclusive an attention to the supernatural element. The language even of Hooker, for example, in this matter would hardly

[1] It is only just to remark of M. Renan, (1) that the tone of a recent article by him seems to show very great improvement; (2) that we most fully believe that his deep philological studies must ultimately do excellent service to the cause of Christianity.

be accepted now; nay, we are not sure but that the 'dictation theory,' then prevalent, may not have partially provoked the extreme reaction now in vogue. But, after all admissions respecting the human instrumentality have been made (and we trust to show that we, at least, are prepared to make them in no ungrudging spirit), there remains, side by side, what *we* believe, and myriads have believed, to be an overwhelming mass of proof of the presence of an extraordinary effluence of the Spirit of God.

Take, for instance, the Holy Gospels. We will not attempt to give a description of our own, nor one culled from the pages of Mr. Jowett; we will simply borrow a passage from the *Émile* of Jean Jacques Rousseau:—

'I confess that the majesty of the Scriptures surprises me; the holiness of the Gospel touches my heart. Look at the books of the philosophers, with all their pretension, how small they are when compared with that one! Is it possible that a book at once so sublime and so simple can be the production of men? Is it possible that He whose history it relates is but a man himself? Is that the tone of an enthusiast or of an ambitious sectarian? What gentleness, what purity in his conduct! What touching grace in his teaching! What elevation in his maxims! What profound wisdom in his discourses! What presence of mind, what acuteness and accuracy in his answers! What command over his passions. . . Shall we say that the history of the Gospel is invented at will? My friend, that is not the way things are invented; and the deeds of Socrates, which no one disputes, are less well attested than those of Jesus Christ. In short, it is thrusting back the difficulty without destroying it; it would be more inconceivable that several men had joined in fabricating this book, than it is that one man should be the subject of it. Jewish authors would never have discovered either that tone or that morality, and the Gospel exhibits characteristics of truth, so great, so striking, and so perfectly inimitable, that its inventor would be more marvellous than its hero.'[1]

Professor Jowett would, we presume, admit the justice of this description. But when he defines inspiration (p. 347) to be 'that idea of Scripture which we gather from the knowledge of it,' surely *we*, without going beyond even the admission of a sceptic like Rousseau, have an immediate right to assert that the idea which Holy Scripture gives of itself *is* peculiar and unique.

It is strange, indeed, and startling in the extreme, after perusing these words of Rousseau, to turn to our author's essay, and read:—

'Nor for any of the higher or supernatural views of inspiration is there any foundation in the Gospels or Epistles.'—P. 345.

We repeat that, if Rousseau's description be correct, there *is* foundation enough in the mere impress thus effected upon thousands in all climes and ages. The Koran, largely (though, we admit, indirectly) borrowed from the Bible, does not produce the

[1] Émile. Liv. iv. (cit. ap. M. Nicolas. Troisième Partie. chap. iii.)

same kind of impress. The Vedas? what stamp have they succeeded in impressing upon the land of their nativity? 'The conversion of the whole people to the worst form that Christianity ever wore in the darkest ages would be a happy event. It is not necessary that a man should be a Christian to wish for the propagation of Christianity in India. It is sufficient that he should be an European not much below the ordinary European level of good sense and humanity. In no part of the world is heathenism more cruel, more licentious, more fruitful of absurd rites and pernicious laws.' This is not the language of some ardent missionary, who may be accused of looking at everything, as it were, through a coloured glass. No! it is the utterance of a statesman and historian, who had lived for many years in Hindostan, the late Lord Macaulay.[1]

But Mr. Jowett perhaps attempts to adduce some proof of this bold and sweeping piece of dogmatism? He does attempt it, and his argument is precisely parallel in its nature to the proof which the Socinian endeavours to adduce of the *mere* Humanity of the Incarnate Word; that proof which consists in the selection of all the texts that go to establish the Manhood (which the Church most firmly maintains), and ignores, because it will not or cannot see them, the passages which assert or imply His Godhead.

Against the proof of a human element, which Mr. Jowett would deduce from such passages as S. John xix. 35,[2] S. Luke i. 1, 2, &c. we have not one word to urge. We should just as soon think of denying the Unitarian's inference that our Lord is Man. But where are the obvious passages which seem to assert for Holy Writ a different, but a co-existent, claim? Wherever they *may* be met with, there is not, we believe, more than one in Mr. Jowett's one hundred pages, and the force of that one (2 Tim. iii. 16) is in our judgment rather evaded than met. Let us turn our eyes upon a few.

'For this cause also thank we God without ceasing, because, 'when ye received the word of God which ye heard of us, ye 'received it not as the word of men, but as it is in truth, the word 'of God, which effectually worketh also in you that believe.' Such is the language of S. Paul in his very first Epistle (1 Thess. ii. 13); and on the phrase *word of God* (λόγον Θεοῦ) a recent commentator rightly remarks, 'the Divine word, not

[1] Essays reprinted from *Edinburgh Review*. (*Art.* Gladstone on Church and State.)

[2] It has been urged by some that the change of pronoun in this verse is meant to embody an appeal to our Lord, 'and He (the Lord) knoweth that he (the witness) saith true.' This would not be the case in Demosthenes, and perhaps cannot be safely pressed; though it must be owned that this Evangelist's use of the demonstrative pronouns is apparently so vague and lax as to render it very difficult to lay down precise rules respecting his construction.

'the word which tells of God, *but the word of which God is* '*author.*' (Jowett on Thessalonians, &c. *in loc. cit*). Cf. S. Matth x. 20. 'For it is not ye that speak, but the spirit of 'your Father which speaketh in you:' and Acts iv. 8. 'Then 'Peter, filled with the Holy Ghost, said, &c. and the entire passage in 1 Cor. ii. 4—13, especially the 13th verse, 'which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth.' Moreover, it must not be forgotten, that although the essayists may probably be all agreed in the rejection of the second Epistle of S. Peter as spurious, yet that the Church throughout the world has not yet accepted this decision as final. Until it be distinctly proved —not that there were some doubts about this, as about a few other books of the New Testament, but—that the Church has concluded wrongfully in admitting it, we must continue to hold that S. Peter includes the Epistles of S. Paul among 'the other Scriptures' (2 S. Peter iii. 16), and that consequently the epithet *θεόπνευστος* cannot (despite Mr. Jowett's remarks) be limited to the canon of the Old Testament.

Is there any other book on earth of which the later portion, written after a long interval and in a different language, contains references to the elder portions of the following kind? 'For God commanded, saying' (S. Matth. xv. 4), 'Have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God' (*Id.* xxii. 31). 'David *in spirit* calleth Him Lord' (*Id.* xxii. 44). 'David said by the Holy Ghost' (S. Mark xii. 36). 'As it is written in the law of the Lord' (S. Luke ii. 23, 24). 'God, who by the mouth of thy servant David hast said' (Acts iv. 24, 25). 'Well spake the Holy Ghost by Esaias the prophet unto our fathers' (Acts xxviii. 25).

If there is no such book elsewhere, then the Bible is peculiar and unique; and this superintendence of the Holy Spirit is, in some way we can never perhaps fully understand in this life, compatible with the play of individuality in the writers, and with evidences of humanity which at times almost take us by surprise. And here we must pause, and leave the reader to meditate for himself upon the character of that astounding declaration, that 'for any of the higher or supernatural views of inspiration there is no foundation in the Gospels or Epistles.'

We had hoped to find time for a few remarks on some other points not immediately connected with any of the above divisions —as, for instance, the Ninevite inscriptions and the Egyptian account of the Exodus—but, for the present, we must forbear. We feel thankful that we have at any rate been enabled to fill up in some slight degree the primary outlines of our sketch.

ART. VII.—*Notitia Editionis Codicis Bibliorum Sinaitici auspiciis Imperatoris Alexandri II. susceptæ. Accessit Catalogus Codicum nuper ex Oriente Petropolin perlatorum: item Origenis Scholia in Proverbia Salomonis, partim nunc primum, partim secundum atque emendatius edita: cum duabus tabulis lapidi incisis.* Edidit ÆNOTH. FRID. CONST. TISCHENDORF, &c. Lipsiæ: F. A. Brockhaus. 1860.

IF the year 1858 was remarkable in the history of Biblical criticism, still more does it seem probable that the year 1859 will be so regarded. In the former year, a MS. Bible, written and read in the fourth century of the Christian era, transcending all others in antiquity, which had been long stored amid the treasures of the Vatican and zealously guarded from the examination of scholars, first appeared in print. It was, as was supposed, an unique treasure, to which nothing existed or could be expected to appear 'simile aut secundum.' But, within a few months from the time of its publication, the learned world was astonished by the announcement, that a copy of the Holy Scriptures, equal, as it was said, to the Vatican in age, and, as regards the New Testament, superior to it in completeness, had been discovered by Professor Tischendorf; and, by a remarkable contrast, as the one had been stored up in the metropolis, so to say, of Western Christendom, the other was found in that Holy Mountain whence the Law had been issued, in the region where probably some of the earliest portions of the sacred writings had been penned.

This announcement was received with astonishment, not unmixed with incredulity; doubts if not of the genuineness, yet at least of the antiquity of the MS., were naturally felt. And curiosity was excited to the highest degree as to the characteristics and contents of this new witness to the state of the sacred text in the primitive ages.

Information respecting it has come forth, as was natural, from time to time, which, while it has imperfectly gratified, has certainly kept alive and stimulated our curiosity and interest. A letter from Professor Tischendorf, dated Cairo, March 15, 1859, announced the discovery, and gave a general account of the MS. and its contents, sufficiently exact to indicate its great value and its probable antiquity. This letter was addressed to the Saxon Minister of Worship, Von Falkenstein, and was published in the supplement to the 'Leipziger Zeitung' of April 15, 1859.

The following is the substance of the letter (we extract it from the 'Journal of Sacred Literature' for July, 1859) :—

'The kindness shown to me by your Excellency on my departure from my native land, makes it my agreeable duty to address to you the first account of a very important literary discovery which the Lord's good hand has vouchsafed to my new investigations in the East. You know what weight the learned world attaches to the famous Vatican MS. of the Bible, and how it has for centuries been esteemed one of the special treasures of the Papal library; you are aware how anxious men have been, and how difficult they have found it, to collate even single passages, how earnestly Mai's edition, undertaken by order of the Pope, had been looked for since 1828, and how gladly it was at last received, at Easter 1858, after thirty years' delay.

'If I should now say that Providence has preserved in the corner of the so-often ransacked cloisters of the East, a MS. which may rank with the Vatican in regard to its character, extent, and age, and which on some accounts claims the precedence of it, I shall not be surprised if some doubt my skill, and the questions be put—Is it indeed true? Is it even possible? And yet as I held in my hands for the first time the precious leaves, in a convent chamber at the foot of Moses' Mount (Ghebel Mousa), my own astonishment and wonder were as great as can be imagined.

'The MS. of whose discovery I inform you consists of 346 fine and fair parchment leaves of so large a size that two of them have required a whole gazelle skin. The writing, upon each leaf and arranged in four columns, is of the most ancient character, and is mostly (and especially on the outside of the skin) preserved with wonderful distinctness, but on the flesh side it is sometimes less legible, and much more difficult to decide respecting the numerous and certainly very ancient corrections to which the Codex has been subjected.

'Such MSS. confessedly never have a date. It is the problem of palæography, by careful attention to all the peculiarities of each separate MS., from the character of the letter forms employed, from the interpunction, from the use of initials, and subscriptions, and inscriptions; from the parchment, from the tints of the ink, the old corrections, etc., to ascertain more or less satisfactorily its antiquity. As to this MS., there scarcely was needed a date to fix the century, for that it was written in the fourth century can be confirmed by all the arguments which have any weight in palæographic science, almost beyond all question.

'The Vatican Codex goes back to the same century in my opinion and that of other able men. The only other Greek parchment MS. to which I had before given a chronological place prior to the Vatican, was the Leipsic Codex Friderico-Augustanus, but this, as I am already convinced, is a relic of the very MS. of which I am so happy as to find these important constituents.

'This MS. still contains, first, considerable portions of the Old Testament, namely, most of the greater and lesser prophets, the Psalms, Job, Jesus-Sirach, Wisdom, and several other Apocryphal books. These are followed by the entire New Testament. And herein lies the extraordinary significance of the discovery. Only three extensive Biblical MSS. of high Christian antiquity have come down to us from the fourth century to the ninth. The most comprehensive among them is the London Codex Alexandrinus, which wants almost the whole of Matthew's gospel, as well as considerable part of 2 Corinthians, and two chapters of John's gospel. From the Vatican MS. still more is absent, namely, the Apocalypse and four Pauline epistles altogether, with a third part of the epistle to the Hebrews. But of the MS. of the New Testament now found, not a single leaflet is wanting! It is, moreover, the only one among the MSS. of the New Testament of a thousand years old and upwards, which is complete. The divine who knows the importance attached to the MSS. of

that age, in the endeavour to fix the apostolic text, will accept this as a principal authority. It is a new pledge of the possibility of deciding and restoring the genuine apostolic text, to which this doubtless is a close approximation, as to the main features of it. I only add, that my examination of the MS. convinces me of its perfectly coinciding in age with the Vatican Codex.

'I have yet to name two other component parts of the same MS., the discovery of which alone would have sufficed to make my new journey fortunate and successful. Next to the Bible, the most precious literature of the Church is the writings of the apostolic fathers. We have but few remains of this class, and these few are for the most part often in doubtful texts, imperfect, or only extant in translations. It is thus with the so-called Epistle of Barnabas, which, if not composed by a companion of Paul, must have been written very soon after the end of the first century. It is quoted both by Clement and Origen, in the second and third centuries, as even a part of Holy Scripture, and still later, such writers as Eusebius refer to it as among the doubtful books of the Canon. This epistle is equal in extent to that to the Romans; several MSS. of it have been found before, but all are modern, and in all alike the first five chapters are wanting, of which the text can be gathered only through a very corrupt Latin version. How great, then, was my wonder when I found the whole of Barnabas in this MS., at the close of the Revelation! I could not lay the volume down till I had read and copied the whole text. Divines will no longer have to read from the uncertain Greek text of late MSS., and a faulty Latin version, the epistle which in the second Christian century was so reverently handled and highly prized.

'In the height of my joy at this discovery I was to have a last surprise. I found a separate portion of fifty-two columns, with the inscription "The Pastor;" it was the first part of the Pastor of Hermas, also pertaining to the second century, and likewise claiming a kind of apostolic regard. Till recently, its Greek text was thought to be lost. This MS. proves that in the earliest times both Barnabas and Hermas were reckoned as constituent parts of Scripture by some, if their authority was also doubted. Of Hermas, Simonides confessedly brought a very perfect Greek text to Leipsic, part copied by him from a MS. at Mount Athos, and part upon three paper leaves of the fourteenth or fifteenth century. After this text was published in December 1855, and repeated soon after by me more accurately, considerable doubt arose about it, whether it was really ancient or a mediæval translation from the Latin. I especially opposed the last view, and my opinion is confirmed by these leaves, at least 1,000 years older, showing that the Leipsic text had been derived from the original, but is corrupt, and that in consequence of a mediæval use of the Latin.

'I am glad that the scientific mission committed to me by the Russian Government, and promoted by you, has at its outset so noble a literary discovery as its result. Relying upon the Imperial favour, I venture already to set before the learned world the hope of the publication of the MS. A carefully revised copy of its 132,000 columnar lines will be completed by the beginning of April, if God permit. The Vatican MS. was known 300 years before many cherished wishes were gratified in its publication. It may, perhaps, need only so many years instead of so many centuries to enrich the Christian literature with that most precious document now discovered.

'CONSTANTINE TISCHENDORF.'

On his return to Europe, Tischendorf spent some time at Dresden, and there exhibited the rich treasures which he had brought from the East. The King of Saxony had the first opportunity of examining the Sinaitic MS. 'The fortunate

'discoverer laid it before the king, stating that he regarded it as 'a pious duty to permit no eye in his country to see this Chris-'tian treasure before his Majesty himself.' It was seen by the minister, Von Falkenstein, and others; after this it was exhibited to other persons of rank and of learning. Thus the opinion of learned men respecting it became known, and additional interest was attracted to the subject. It was then taken to S. Petersburg; and shortly after it was announced that it was the intention of the Emperor to print a limited number of facsimile copies, and an edition of the text in common type; and it was further intimated that Professor Tischendorf would shortly send out an account of the MS., with a facsimile of the writing, and some account of its readings.

This has now appeared. We believe that we shall best consult the wishes of our readers if we lay before them an abstract of the information which the great and fortunate discoverer of the MS. has just published.

In the month of May, in the year 1844, Tischendorf made his first visit to the monastery of S. Catharine at Mount Sinai. On that occasion he discovered, in a basket, the remains of a very old MS. of the LXX. version. He was at once aware of their value, and was fortunate enough to rescue them from their place of destination, *the fire!* Being in very bad condition, they were given up to him, and were afterwards published by him in 1846, under the title of *Codex Friderico-Augustanus.* To the fragments contained in this publication we shall have occasion to refer presently. This was not, however, the only discovery made by Tischendorf in 1844. A larger portion of the same MS. was also brought to light containing the whole of Isaiah, books of the Maccabees, and other parts of the Old Testament. This larger portion the monks would not part with. Tischendorf, however, pointed out to them its value, and recommended them to keep it very carefully. And in one sense they did so; for when he paid his second visit to the monastery, in 1853, this larger portion was nowhere to be found. He supposed these larger remains had been taken to Europe. He had, however, in 1844, transcribed the last page of Isaiah from the MS., and this he published among his *Monumenta Sacra* in 1855. It is worth while to note that Tischendorf, when he first discovered these fragments in 1844, pronounced them to be of the fourth century.

The indefatigable collector and collator paid a third visit to Mount Sinai, and was most kindly received by the inmates of the monastery. He arrived there on the thirty-first of January, 1859. He seems not to have contemplated a long visit, as on

the fourth of February a servant was despatched to fetch camels, in order that he might start for Egypt on the seventh. On this same fourth of February, however, the Professor took a walk with one of the members of the monastery, whom he calls the *œconomus*. He had presented to the brethren some copies of his editions of the LXX. and the New Testament; and the subject of conversation between him and the *œconomus*, during their walk, turned on the LXX. version. On their return, they went to the cell of the *œconomus*, where he informed Tischendorf that he had in his possession a MS. of the LXX. He produced it wrapped up in a cloth; and what was the astonishment of his visitor on beholding copious remains of the very MS., parts of which he had previously seen in 1844, and in vain inquired for afterwards! There was the whole of Isaiah which he had then seen, but which he could not find in 1853, with other books of the Old Testament, to be mentioned presently. But besides these remains of the LXX., there was the New Testament entire; 'totum ne minima quidem lacuna deformatum;' together with the Epistle of Barnabas and the first part of the Shepherd of Hermas. The leaves were pretty nearly loose in the cloth. Tischendorf was allowed to take the precious document to his chamber, where he first of all piously gave thanks to God for the good fortune which had befallen him. Sleep was out of the question; so he spent the night in transcribing the Epistle of Barnabas. The MS., it seems, had found its way into the *cella sceuophylacis*, the receptacle for books, chiefly liturgical, and for the sacred vessels; from which receptacle it had been taken by the *œconomus*.

Tischendorf then proposed to the brethren that they should send the MS. to Cairo, in order that he might transcribe it there; and to this proposal they agreed, so soon as they should have obtained permission from their superiors at Cairo. On the seventh of February, the day which was originally intended, he set out from Mount Sinai, and arrived at Cairo on the thirteenth of February. He lost no time in obtaining from the superiors there the required permission; and such was the despatch employed that, in nine days, a messenger went from Cairo to Sinai and back, bringing with him on his return the venerable parchments; these Tischendorf received from the hands of the superiors at Cairo on the twenty-fourth of February.

Within two months, the transcription was finished by himself, aided by two friends. There were in the MS. more than 100,000 lines. Corrections had been made by different hands in the MS. to the amount of about 8,000; and these occasioned much trouble and delay, as, of course, it was necessary to distinguish the correctors from the original scribe and from each other.

The idea then struck the Professor that the Sinaitic monks

might be induced to make an offer of the MS. through him to the Emperor of Russia. They took the suggestion in good part; but there was a difficulty about obtaining a formal agreement to the presentation, as the brethren were at this time without a head. But they agreed to allow Tischendorf to take the MS. to S. Petersburg for the purpose of preparing his edition: 'Utpote datum ad tempus donec in perpetuum datum esse archiepiscopus collegii nomine significaret.' And on this understanding the MS. was delivered to him at Cairo, 28th September, 1859.

It appears that Porphyrius, a Russian archimandrite of considerable learning, saw, in the course of a journey which he made in 1845-6, the very remains which were afterwards brought to light by Tischendorf; but though he stayed for some time at the convent, he made no use of them either for criticism or publication, and in his remarks (published 1856) on the writing, age, and text of the MS., Tischendorf considers him often mistaken. The archimandrite indeed seems not to have been aware that the first part of S. Barnabas' Epistle, and almost the whole of the Shepherd, were not extant in Greek.

We may now proceed from the history of the discovery of the MS. to the plans arranged for its publication.

According to the scheme approved by the Emperor of Russia, the Codex Sinaiticus is to be printed in facsimile, as it was written by the original scribe, 'Quemadmodum ipsa prima manus exaravit.' Fortunately, so equable is the size of the letters, that they might seem to have been printed rather than written. Not only will the forms of the letters be accurately represented, but also the size of the MS., the columns in each page, the number of lines in each column, the different lengths of the lines which mark the beginning and end of a section, and even the colour of the ink, which Tischendorf describes as being 'magis fuscum quam nigrum.' The facsimile will also represent the matter written in the margin by the first and second correctors, who were themselves of a very ancient date; also what these correctors marked as delenda in the MS. either by points over the letter or by hooks (uncorum signis). But the changes made by later correctors will not be represented in the facsimile; these will all be given in notes. Besides the printed facsimile representing as nearly as possible the entire text of the MS., there will be twenty photographed and lithographed plates, which will give an exact representation of so many pages selected for their critical or palæographical value.

The first volume of the facsimile will contain those parts of the Old Testament which are written four columns to a page. The second will contain the poetical books of the Old Testament,

which are written stichometrically, two columns to a page. The third will comprise the New Testament, with the epistle of S. Barnabas and the remains of the Shepherd. The fourth volume will contain the twenty plates mentioned before; prolegomena on the history and date of the MS.; on the relation of its text to that of other MSS., &c. with critical notes on the old corrections and other palæographical matter; facsimiles of old MSS. will be added for the purpose of comparison. Three hundred copies of this noble facsimile are to be printed; the cost of which must be enormous: it is to be defrayed by the Emperor of Russia, and the imperial munificence designs the printed copies, not for sale, but for presentation throughout Christendom. The work is to appear at S. Petersburg, about the middle of the year 1862, by way of shedding additional lustre on the thousandth anniversary of the foundation of the Russian empire by Ruricus, general of the Varagi. Not only will imperial munificence excite our admiration, but the rapidity of execution will raise our astonishment. In the case of the great facsimile of the text of the LXX. from the Alexandrine MS. edited by Baber, the first volume came out at London in 1812, the third in 1826. But Professor Tischendorf desires to gratify the curiosity of the literary world as soon as possible. And letters which he has received from learned men of our country, *a doctis Britannis*, he says, made him aware how anxious we in England are to reap the fruit of his labours.

Besides the imperial facsimile edition, Tischendorf will likewise publish, partly at the expense of the Emperor, a cheap edition for common use. In this edition, the text will be reduced from uncials to cursives, and the words will be divided; but they will be without accents or punctuation, and will be arranged like the original, four columns to a page. The edition will contain the more important part of the prolegomena, the critical notes, and a facsimile plate. It will be published at Leipsic, (by Brockhaus,) in parts, and it is proposed to commence with the publication of the New Testament, together with the Epistle of S. Barnabas, and the fragments of the Shepherd, in 1862.

We may now proceed to the description and contents of the Codex Sinaiticus.

The MS. contains 346½ leaves. The Old Testament occupies 199 leaves. The New Testament, with Barnabas and the Shepherd, occupies 147½ leaves. The fragments of the Old Testament commence with one from 1 Chron. c. ix. x. xi., contained in one leaf. Then follow six leaves, containing the book of Tobit entire, commencing from ch. ii. 2. the very part where the portion of the MS. previously discovered and published as the

Codex Friderico-Augustanus, breaks off, viz. at the words, τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἡμῶν. The next eight leaves contain the book of Judith entire. The next twenty-six, the first and the fourth books of the Maccabees entire. The twenty-six following contain Isaiah entire, and the first six leaves of Jeremiah, the rest from x. 25 to the end, having been previously found and printed in the edition of the Codex Friderico-Augustanus. The next fourteen leaves contain Joel, Obadiah, Jonah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi. These are followed by the body of poetical books entire, the βίβλοι στιχηρεῖς, written stichometrically, two columns in a page, thus: forty leaves contain the Psalms, fifteen the Proverbs, five Ecclesiastes, three the Song, nine the Wisdom of Solomon, twenty-five Ecclesiasticus, fifteen the book of Job. Then follows the New Testament. The Gospels stand first in their usual order. Then the Pauline epistles in the common order, except that the Epistle to the Hebrews is placed between the 2 Thessalonians and the 1 Timothy, as in the Codex Alexandrinus and the Vatican. The Acts of the Apostles comes next, then the Catholic epistles in the common order, then the Revelation, then βαρναβα επιστολη, then a portion of the ποιμην. Between the end of Barnabas' epistle and the beginning of the ποιμην, six leaves have been lost. It is possible that other leaves following the ποιμην may also have perished.

The most important question comes next—What is the age of the MS.? The arguments to indicate its probable antiquity are thus stated by its discoverer.

1. It is written on parchment, in uncial characters, resembling those found in the Herculaneum and other papyrus MSS. The letters are remarkable for great purity of form, as well the square as the round ones; and the same law holds good even in the small letters that occur at the end of a line, when there is a want of space. The general appearance of the letters marks the MS., Professor Tischendorf thinks, as one that was written between the first and the fifth centuries.

2. This MS. has not any initial letters distinguished by larger size from the others. Such initial letters are probably not earlier than the fifth century. They are found in the MSS. marked A, C, D; but not in the papyri, or the most ancient MSS., *e.g.* the Vatican, and the fragments of the Octateuch at Paris. The commencement of a section is marked by the projection of about one letter from the vertical line of the column; the sections are not the same as those of the Vatican MS.

3. There is in the Codex Sinaiticus very little punctuation, and what there is, is of the most simple kind. In this respect, this MS. resembles the Vatican and the papyri.

4. It is well known that the Vatican MS. has three columns in a page; that is, when the MS. is open, six columns are presented to the eye. From this arrangement Hug argued for its antiquity, as he thought that the parallel juxta-position of the six columns indicated the period of transition from the *volume*-form, strictly so called, to the book-form of the MS. The *book*, he thought, was purposely written in the columnar form, to look like the *roll* to which readers had previously been accustomed. Hug knew no other instance except a fragment of Dio Cassius. Others have since been found. *A fortiori* the Codex Sinaiticus, with its eight columns presented to the eye, may be held to be of great antiquity.

Arguments from orthography, from the order of books in New Testament, from the inscriptions and subscriptions attached to these books (which are extremely simple), from the different corrections, are for the present passed over by Tischendorf, being reserved for the fuller account to be hereafter given in his prolegomena. He notices next,—

5. The absence of the Ammonian sections and the Eusebian canons. These began to come into general use in MSS. of the Gospels about the middle of the fourth century. Now, the Codex Sinaiticus, as first written, like the Vatican, has not either the sections or the canons.

6. Another note of antiquity is the circumstance that the epistle of Barnabas, and the fragments of the Pastor, seem to stand in this MS. as part of the books of the New Testament. These writings were (more or less) regarded as quasi-canonical in the second and third centuries. Before the middle of the fourth century, however, Eusebius classed them among the *ἀντιλεγόμενα*, together with the Acts of S. Paul and the Apocalypse of S. Peter. They are omitted from the list of canonical books sent out by the council of Laodicea in 364, and by that of Carthage in 397. And by the end of the fourth century these two writings were generally admitted to be not canonical. The six leaves which were mentioned as having been lost between Barnabas and the Pastor might possibly, Tischendorf thinks, have contained another of the *ἀντιλεγόμενα*; and others might, perhaps, have followed the Shepherd. The instance of the two epistles of Clement, which are appended to the New Testament in the Alexandrine MS., Tischendorf does not consider to be parallel; as he thinks it very doubtful whether the first epistle of Clement was ever regarded as a canonical book, and quite certain that the second never was.

7. A further note of antiquity is derived from two very remarkable omissions occurring in the text of this MS.

Eusebius, who died 340, says, that in his time the last twelve

verses which, in the ordinary copies, close the Gospel of S. Mark, were wanting in almost all the accurate copies. A like statement is made by S. Gregory Nyssen and S. Jerome. Now, in the existing Greek MSS. from the fifth century downwards, *i.e.* in the three early uncials marked A, C, D, fourteen uncials of later date, all the cursive MSS., also in seven MSS. of the Italic version, all of the Vulgate, and all of the Syriac versions, these verses are found. The newly discovered MS. agrees with the Vatican in not containing the verses, and this fact seems (Tischendorf thinks) to point to a Eusebian date.

Again, S. Basil (about the middle of the fourth century) says that, in Eph. i. 1, the words εν εφεσω were wanting in the old MSS. Here, again, Origen read without εν εφεσω. Now, the Sinaitic and Vatican MSS. *alone* have them not in the writing of the original scribe, and so agree with the old copies mentioned by S. Basil.

Such are the notes of antiquity briefly brought forward by Tischendorf for fixing the probable date of the MS. His proofs will no doubt be stated more fully hereafter. For the present it may be remarked, that each note, taken separately, is far from being conclusive.

1. The character of the writing, on his own showing, does not prove the MS. to be older than the beginning of the fifth century; and a comparison with other specimens of ancient writing would, in the judgment of others, point to the fourth, fifth, or perhaps sixth century.

2. The want of initial letters does not of itself prove the ancient date of the MS. A MS. of later date might have been transcribed according to the ancient form in this respect. The same holds good as regards the omissions in S. Mark and the Ephesians.

3. The same remark may be made about the punctuation. An elaborate punctuation would indicate a late date, but the simpler punctuation of the ancient copies might have been preserved in later copies. The Codex Bezæ at Cambridge, written perhaps about the middle of the sixth century, has but little punctuation.

4. Hug's hypothesis about the columnar form of writing as marking the transition period from the *volume* to the *book*, is certainly ingenious, and MAY be true, but it seems to want more confirmation from facts.

5. The *presence* of the Ammonian sections and Eusebian canons by the original scribe would undoubtedly show that the MS. where they occurred must have been written *after* a certain date; but their absence does not *prove* that the MS. was written *before* that date. The Alexandrine MS., written about the

middle of the fifth century, has the Ammonian sections and the Eusebian canons. The Codex Ephraemi rescriptus (*C*), written *before* the middle of that century, has the sections, not the canons. The Codex Bezæ (*D*), written about the middle of the sixth century, has the sections, not the canons. We give Tischendorf's own dates.

6. Barnabas and the Pastor seem to hold in this MS. a position similar to the two Clementine epistles in the Alexandrine. Now in that MS. under the heading of H ΚΑΙΝΗ ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ, the books of the New Testament are specified, and after

ΑΠΟΚΑΛΥΨΙC ΙΩΑΝΝΟΥ, there follow
ΚΛΗΜΕΝΤΟC ΕΠΙCΤΟΛΗ Ā,
ΚΛΗΜΕΝΤΟC ΕΠΙCΤΟΛΗ B̄,

ΟΜΟΥ ΒΙΒΛΙΑ (number now erased),

ΨΑΛΜΟΙ CΟΛΟΜΩΝΤΟΣ.
ΙΗ̄ ΙΗ̄

If, then, the presence of Barnabas and Hermas shows the antiquity of the Sinaitic MS., the presence of the Epistles of Clement would imply the antiquity of the Alexandrine. If, however, other reasons exist which prove the last-mentioned MS. to be of later date, notwithstanding its containing those Epistles, it cannot be certainly argued that the Sinaitic is early, from the mere circumstance of its having the Epistle of Barnabas and the Shepherd of Hermas. The distinction which Tischendorf would draw between the books is ingenious, but scarcely sufficient, as in *some* churches the first Epistle of Clement was read: and the second would share its place of honour.

The *ψαλμοι σολομωντος* are evidently excluded from the *Biblia* by the writer of the Alexandrine MS., but the two Clementines seem as evidently included. Now Tischendorf thinks the Alexandrine was written 'medio fere sæculo quinto.' Why may not Barnabas and Hermas stand in the same relation to the Sinaitic, as the two Clementines to the Alexandrine? If so, why may not this MS. (so far as this one argument is concerned) have been written 'medio fere sæculo quinto'?

But whatever may be thought of each argument taken singly, it must be admitted that, when the whole are taken collectively, they do in their united result appear to have considerable weight. They all point the same way, and converge towards one issue. So far as we yet know, there is nothing to set against them. Till the MS. has been thoroughly tested by experienced palæographists, we should be premature in deciding upon its actual date. Nevertheless we will, for the present, rest

in the persuasion that the arguments of Tischendorf carry with them a fair amount of probability.

We now proceed to what will be most interesting to our critical readers; to give a selection from the readings in the MS. which are presented to us in this work.

In order to simplify and contract our statement, we shall use the received symbolical letters to represent the great MSS. And first, ℵ is to stand for the newly discovered MS. The Roman and Greek capitals were well-nigh exhausted by the uncial MSS., chiefly fragments, already known; so Tischendorf has had recourse to the Hebrew, the first letter of which may well remind us, both of the Oriental source from which the MS. has been derived, and its own probable claim to high antiquity. For the others, the less learned of our readers will only need to be reminded that *A* is the Alexandrine MS. supposed to have been written in the middle of the fifth century; *B*, the Vatican, of the fourth; *C*, the *Codex Ephraemi rescriptus*, before the middle of the fifth; *D*, in the Gospels and Acts, the Codex Bezæ, or Cantabrigiensis, of the sixth; *L*, *Codex Regius*, No. 62 at Paris, a later MS., but valued for its text; Δ, the Codex Sangallensis of the Gospels, cent. ix.; *Z*, the Dublin *Codex Rescriptus* of S. Matthew, cent. vi. The ^{1} attached to the letter, as $\aleph^1$, B^1, means the writing of the original scribe, when it has to be contrasted with the writing of correctors indicated by later numbers, *e.g.* B^2, B^3.

We observe, first, that the Codex Sinaiticus continually confirms the readings of the older MSS.: especially it confirms the readings of the Vatican MS., even when that MS. stands alone among the uncials. There are many instances of this: we will cite one or two as specimens.

S. Matt. iii. 16. καὶ εἶδε τὸ Πνεῦμα τοῦ Θεοῦ καταβαῖνον ὡσεὶ περιστερὰν, καὶ ἐρχόμενον ἐπ' αὐτόν.

$\aleph^1$ confirms *B* (alone among uncials) in omitting καὶ before ἐρχόμενον: 'I saw the Spirit of God descending as a dove, coming upon Him.'

S. Matt. v. 22. 'He that is angry with his brother *without a cause*.'

ℵ omits εἰκῇ with *B*, and some cursives only. There is distinct ancient testimony, both of Greek writers and of S. Jerome, that the correct MSS. did not have the word, that it was an addition. S. Jerome says expressly, '*in plerisque codicibus antiquis additum non est*.'

S. Matt. viii. 31. Where we have 'Suffer us to go into the herd of swine,' ℵ has ἀπόστειλον ἡμᾶς ('Send us into,' &c.), with *B*, four cursives, and many versions.

S. Matt. xi. 19. *καὶ ἐδικαιώθη ἡ σοφία ἀπὸ τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς.*

For *τέκνων* B^1 alone among uncials reads *ἔργων*. ℵ confirms this; *i.e.* 'wisdom is justified of her *deeds*.' Strange as this may seem to us, Jerome testifies to its being the reading of some MSS. in his time, and it is found in many ancient versions. The presence of the reading is a mark of antiquity.

S. Matt. xvi. 2, 3. *ὀψίας—οὐ δύνασθε;*

This passage, a verse and a half, is omitted in ℵ, as it is in the Vatican, and two later uncials *V* and X and some cursives; so that the words would run in the English, 'And he answered and said unto them, An evil and adulterous generation.' &c. But S. Jerome explicitly asserts that 'it was not contained in very many MSS.' in his time; he says '*hoc in plerisque codicibus non habetur*.' This is an external testimony to the agreement of these MSS. with the ancient texts.

S. Mark i. 16. *βάλλοντας ἀμφίβληστρον.*

Here *ἀμφιβάλλοντας* is the reading of ℵ, with *A*, *B*, *D*, and other uncials, while ℵ omits *ἀμφίβληστρον* with *B* and *L*; having simply *ἀμφιβάλλοντας*.

S. Mark xiii. 14. After 'the abomination of desolation,' the great majority of MSS. have 'which was spoken of by Daniel the prophet.' ℵ with *B*, *D*, *L*, omits the words. Ancient authorities confirm the omission. The clause was probably added from S. Matthew.

As an instance of mere form in the writing of a word; ℵ confirms *B* in writing *βεεζεβουλ* for *βεελζεβουλ*, in S. Matt. x. 25. In S. Matt. iv. 18, $\aleph^1$ confirms the hitherto solitary witness of *C* for *αλεεις* instead of *αλιεις*, though it does not do so in the following verse. In S. Matt. xxvii. 54, ℵ reads with *D* alone *ἑκατοντάρχης* for *ἑκατόνταρχος*.

But though ℵ frequently confirms *B*, it does not do so by any means invariably; *e.g.*—

S. Luke vi. 34. *ποία ὑμῖν χάρις ἐστί;*

B alone omits *ἐστι*; ℵ confirms the common reading.

S. Luke viii. 16. *ἀλλ' ἐπὶ λυχνίας ἐπιτίθησιν, ἵνα οἱ εἰσπορευόμενοι βλέπωσι τὸ φῶς.*

ℵ agrees with *B*, *D*, and other uncials, in reading *τίθησιν*: but *B* alone omits from *ἵνα* to *φῶς*: these words ℵ confirms.

Eph. ii. 5. *καὶ ὄντας ἡμᾶς νεκροὺς τοῖς παραπτώμασι.*

B reads *ἐν τοῖς παρ.* and adds *καὶ ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις*. ℵ confirms the common reading.

There is another most noteworthy circumstance. It is often said that the later non-uncial MSS. may represent, and can in many instances be proved to represent, ancient readings which are not found in the earliest MS. They have transcribed and so preserved the earlier text. Now there is a remarkable confirmation of the truth of this remark, in the fact that sometimes the Codex Sinaiticus contains a reading which hitherto was found only in non-uncial MSS.; *e.g.*—

S. Matt. xxiii. 35. After *Ζαχαρίου* ℵ[1] omits the words *υἱοῦ Βαραχίου*, with two evangelisteria. Eusebius also on two occasions omits them.

As an instance of mere form: in S. Luke iv. 16, ℵ confirms one cursive (33), and Origen, in writing *Ναζαρὰ* for *Ναζαρέθ*.

Rev. ii. 10. *μηδὲν φοβοῦ ἃ μέλλεις πάσχειν.*

ℵ confirms *μηδὲν*, with most of the cursives, against *μὴ* of the uncials, *A*, *B* 2066,[1] a MS. of the beginning of the eighth century, *C*, &c.

Rev. ii. 20. *ὅτι ἐᾷς τὴν γυναῖκα Ἰεζαβήλ.*

A B (2066) add *σου* after *γυναικα*. ℵ omits *σου*, with almost all the cursives, and many versions.

While then this newly-discovered Codex does in general agree with older uncials, it is yet different from each of them in certain instances, and sometimes supports a reading found in no other uncial. These facts seem to point to the antiquity and the independence of the MS.

The following are specimens of more important readings, taken from the books of the New Testament in order:—

S. Matt. i. 25. *ἕως οὗ ἔτεκε τον υἱὸν αὐτῆς τον πρωτότοκον.*

ℵ, with *B*, *Z*, and others: *ἕως οὗ ἔτεκεν υἱον*: *i.e.* he 'knew her not, till she brought forth *a* son.'

In the well-known passages about the country of the Gergesenes, ℵ reads, S. Matt. viii. 28, ℵ[1] *γαζαρηνῶν*: S. Mark v. 1, *γερασηνῶν*: S. Luke viii. 37, ℵ[1], ℵ[3], *γεργεσηνῶν*, ℵ[2] *γαδαρηνῶν*.

S. Matt. xviii. 11. *ἦλθε γαρ ὁ υἱος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου (ζητησαι καὶ) σῶσαι το ἀπολωλός.*

This whole verse is omitted in ℵ, as it is in *B*, *L*[1], some good cursives, some versions, and Fathers. It is considered by critical editors not to be genuine, but to have been introduced

[1] We need scarcely say that *B* (the great Codex Vaticanus) does not contain the Apocalypse. *B* therefore here indicates another uncial MS. in the Vatican, numbered 2066.

from the parallel passage of S. Luke xix. 20. It sounds out of place.

S. Matt. xxiv. 36. *περὶ δὲ τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης καὶ τῆς ὥρας οὐδεὶς οἶδεν, οὐδὲ οἱ ἄγγελοι τῶν οὐρανῶν.*

ℵ, with *B*, *D*, adds *οὐδὲ ὁ υἱὸς*, as we find the reading in S. Mark x. This, again, is an interesting passage critically: as we have the statements of S. Jerome (and of S. Ambrose) that the words were not in the best Greek texts, as those of Origen and Pierius. So also of S. Basil and others, that they are not in the correct text of S. Matthew, but only in S. Mark. It follows that the Sinaitic and Vatican MSS. *represent here a bad text.*

However, a more remarkable instance of this is in S. Matt. xxvii. 49., where, after the words 'Let us see whether Elias will come and save Him,' this MS. has the words, 'and another took a 'spear and pierced His side, and there came thereout blood and 'water.' These words are found also in the Vatican MS., in *C*, *L*, *U*, and several cursives. But they are generally considered to be a spurious addition, taken from the narrative of S. John. They are found in few versions. And there is an implied testimony of Eusebius, that they were only in S. John's Gospel. It follows that the readings of the earliest MSS. are not *necessarily* the true readings; as is evident from others of the specimens we are citing.

S. Matt. xxviii. 9. *ὡς δὲ ἐπορεύοντο ἀπαγγεῖλαι τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ.*

ℵ omits these words, with *B*, *D*, while *A*, *C*, and many other uncials have them. Now the fact that the result of criticism, independent of all considerations of the relations of the Gospel narratives, leads to the rejection of these words from the text, ought to reconcile timid persons to the importance of such investigations, inasmuch as the most difficult point in an attempt to harmonize the narratives of the Resurrection arises from the presence of this clause. If it was on the return of the women from the sepulchre, so early on Easter Morning, that our Lord appeared to them, the narrative of the two disciples going to Emmaus would be inexplicable, that certain women 'saw a vision of angels which said that He was alive, *but Him they saw not.*' The subject is fully discussed in Mr. Greswell's 'Dissertations on the Harmony of the Gospels;' and he observes (vol. iii. p. 307), 'It may be added, not because the argument requires it, but on 'purely independent and critical principles, that there is good 'reason to suspect the words in question to be an interpolation. 'The difficulty to which we should be reduced by retaining 'them, and supposing them to have come from S. Matthew 'himself, is almost self-evident; and I think that no skill nor

'ingenuity, without the most unwarrantable assumptions, could 'succeed in harmonising this Evangelist with the rest. Now 'they are marked in Griesbach's edition of the New Testament 'with the note of *probable* omission . . . . Besides, Origen and 'Chrysostom, they are not acknowledged by Jerome or by 'Augustin; they are wanting in *all* the most ancient of the 'versians, such as the Syriac or Peschito, the Arabic, the Persic, 'the Armenian, the Coptic, the old Italic, and the Saxon; and 'what is more, they do not appear in the Codex Vaticanus, or 'the Codex Bezæ,' or, we now add, the Codex Sinaiticus. It is to be observed that the difficulty involved in the presence of the words is by no means so obvious, as to make it conceivable that they were designedly omitted.

S. Mark vii. 16. *εἴ τις ἔχει ὦτα ἀκούειν, ἀκουέτω.*

Omitted in ℵ, as in *B*, *L*, Δ.

S. Mark i. 2. *ἐν τοῖς προφήταις.*

ℵ has *ἐν τῷ Ἡσαΐᾳ τῷ προφήτῃ*, with *B*, *D*, *L*, Δ, (*D* omits *τῷ*), against *A*, *P*.

S. Luke ii. 14. *ἐν ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκία.*

ℵ[1], with *A*, *B*[1], *D*, the old Italic, the Vulgate versions, *εὐδοκίας*. It will be remembered that the author of the Christian Year, in the verses for Christmas Day, followed the reading of the Vulgate:—

> 'Glory to God on high, on earth be peace,
> And love towards men of love—salvation and release.'

In a note he says: 'I have ventured to adopt the reading of the 'Vulgate, as being generally known through Pergolesi's beau- 'tiful composition, "Gloria in excelsis Deo, et in terra pax 'hominibus bonæ voluntatis."' It is remarkable that poetical instinct associated with the strains of music should have clung to the earliest reading, as it now proves to be, being found in the two oldest MSS. so recently brought to light, and confirmed by the concurrent witness of other ancient authorities. Dean Alford must release the ς from the [] in which he has enclosed it.

S. Luke vi. 1. ℵ, with *B*, *L*, &c. omits *δευτεροπρώτῳ*. Tischendorf had omitted the word in his second edition, but restored it in his seventh. Lachman had bracketed it as doubtful. But it is more difficult to account for the introduction, than the omission of such a word; which no one could ever well explain.

S. Luke xxii. 43, 44. *ὤφθη δὲ αὐτῷ ἄγγελος ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ ἐνισχύων αὐτόν· καὶ γενόμενος ἐν ἀγωνίᾳ ἐκτενέστερον προσηύχετο. ἐγένετο δὲ ὁ ἱδρὼς αὐτοῦ ὡσεὶ θρόμβοι αἵματος καταβαίνοντες ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν.*

These two verses are omitted by *A*, *B*, and *R*, an interesting rescript in the British Museum containing fragments of S. Luke under the Syriac text of Severus of Antioch: date about the sixth century. However, ℵ[1, 2] (that is the original scribe and the second corrector of the Sinaitic MS.) confirm the two verses, and with X, a MS. at Munich containing fragments of the four Gospels (written about the end of the ninth century), the Vulgate, and other authorities, reads καταβαίνοντος. The English Authorized Version, by an ambiguity, may represent either reading.

S. John i. 4. ἐν αὐτῷ ζωὴ ἦν.

ℵ has ἔστιν, 'In Him *is* life,' with *D* and other authorities.

S. John i. 18. ὁ μονογενὴς υἱός.

In this remarkable passage we have now another confirmation of the antiquity of the reading attested by so many witnesses: *i.e.* 'The only begotten God, who is in the bosom of the Father;' since ℵ[1] reads, with *B*, *C*[1], *L*, μονογενὴς Θεὸς, omitting ὁ: only in the following words, ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς, it omits ὁ ὢν, apparently being alone in so doing, unless the words in one place of Hilary, 'Filius in sinu Patris,' indicate the same text.

S. John i. 28. For Βηθαβαρᾷ ℵ[1] reads Βηθανίᾳ, with *A*, *B*, *C*[1], and many uncials, &c., but it has been altered into Βηθαραβα. Origen's statement is well known, to the effect that Βηθανίᾳ is the true reading, and that Βηθαβαρᾷ had in his own time been introduced instead of it, by those who thought Βηθανίᾳ a mistake.

S. John v. 1. μετὰ ταῦτα ἦν ἑορτὴ τῶν Ἰουδαίων.

Here ℵ reads ἡ ἑορτὴ, with *C* and other uncials, &c.

S. John v. 4. ἄγγελος—νοσήματι.

'An angel went down into the pool,' &c. This verse is omitted in this MS. as it is in *B*, *C*[1], *D*, and others.

S. John viii. 1—14. This passage, the narrative of the woman taken in adultery, is not found in ℵ, as indeed it would scarcely be expected that it should be there, so almost uniform is its absence from the earliest MSS.

S. John xiii. 2. καὶ δείπνου γενομένου is the reading of *A*, *D*, &c.; that of ℵ[1] is γινομένου, with *B*, *L*, X, and others.

S. John xvi. 13. ὁδηγήσει ὑμᾶς εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν ἀλήθειαν.

'Shall guide you into all the truth.' The newly discovered MS. has ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ, 'in the truth,' the first scribe omitting πάσῃ; excepting this, it agrees with *D*, *L*, and others.

Acts ii. 47. Instead of ὁ δὲ κύριος προσετίθει τοὺς σωζομένους καθ' ἡμέραν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, this MS. with *A*, *B*, *C*, and others reads, ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ instead of τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ. For the interpretation of the passage so read, we refer to the commentators: τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ may perhaps have been an alteration by way of interpretation.

Acts viii. 37. At this place, as elsewhere, we have to regret the partial character of Professor Tischendorf's selection of instances of the reading of the MS. He does not tell us whether ℵ confirms or omits this verse: *i.e.* the confession of faith by the eunuch prior to his Baptism. It was read by S. Irenæus, but is not found in what are held to be the oldest MSS.

Acts xx. 28. Here the Codex confirms the reading τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, with *B* alone of uncials. These two greatest authorities go far to decide that the received words, 'the Church of God, which He purchased with His own Blood,' are genuine.

Rom. iii. 22. εἰς πάντας καὶ ἐπὶ πάντας τοὺς πιστεύοντας.

ℵ[1] omits καὶ ἐπὶ πάντας, with *A*, *B*, *C*, &c.

Rom. v. 1. ℵ[1], τὴν εἰρήνην ἔχωμεν ('Being justified by faith *let us* have peace with God'), with the best ancient authorities.

Rom. xi. 6. εἰ δὲ ἐξ ἔργων, οὐκ ἔτι ἐστὶ χάρις· ἐπεὶ τὸ ἔργον οὐκ ἔτι ἐστὶν ἔργον.

ℵ[1] omits these words, with *A*, *C*, *D*,* and other uncials.

In 1 Cor. vi. 20, Tischendorf tells us that ℵ[1], that is the original scribe, has δοξάσατε τὸν Θεὸν, omitting δὴ, and that δὴ is added *ex emendatione*: but he does not tell us whether it has the words that follow τῷ σώματι in the common texts; 'and in your spirit, which are God's.'

Gal. iv. 25. τὸ γὰρ Ἄγαρ Σινᾶ ὄρος ἐστὶν ἐν τῇ Ἀραβίᾳ.

ℵ omits Ἄγαρ, with *C*, *F*, *G*, and others, and alone adds ὂν after ἐστίν. The passage therefore stands thus in ℵ: τὸ γὰρ Σινᾶ ὄρος ἐστὶν ὂν ἐν τῇ Ἀρ. 'For Sina is a mountain, being in Arabia.'

We look with interest at the text, 'God was manifested in the flesh' (1 Tim. iii. 16). Here ℵ[1] reads ος. Tischendorf has the following note: 'Corrector aliquis, qui omnium ultimus 'textum attigit, sæculi fere duodecimi, reposuit Θεος, sed hoc 'tam caute fecit ut antiquissimam scripturam intactam relin-'queret.' *B* is defective here; C^1 has ος, and we should have said A^1 also: it seemed as if, after the many recent examinations of the MS., specially that by Professor Ellicott, it must

* In the Epistles, *D* signifies the Codex Claromontanus, sæc. vi.; *F*, the Codex Augiensis; and *G*, the Boernerianus, sæc. ix.

be held to be ος: but Mr. Cowper, who has very recently edited the text of the New Testament from that MS., conceives that it is so far doubtful, that he gives the reading as Θεός. We need not remind our readers that the difference is between O and Θ with a line over it.

S. James iii. 5. *ἰδοὺ ὀλίγον πῦρ.*

א *ἡλικὸν*, with *A*, *B*, *C*[1].

1 S. John v. 7, 8. The passage simply stands thus: *ὅτι οἱ τρεῖς εἰσὶν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες, τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ καὶ τὸ αἷμα*, without any addition.

We regret that we must not proceed in our extracts. It is, indeed, scarcely fair to Professor Tischendorf to give all the readings which he has set down; and, besides, many of them are of a kind which are only interesting to minutely critical scholars, and require more exact attention than we could claim from our readers. For these his own work must be referred to.

After the specimens of the readings of the MS., from which we have selected the above instances, Tischendorf gives the text of several portions of the MS. printed in columns and pages, as in the original, only in cursive characters, the words being divided from each other, but not accented or pointed; and notes are subjoined on the corrections made by different hands on these portions.

Eight pages of the Old Testament are given; viz. 1. Tobit xiv. 15 to Judith i. 14; 2. Judith xvi. 9—25; 3. 1 Macc. i. 1—22; 4. Macc. i. 1—29; 5. Esai. i. 1—27; 6. Esai. i. 27—iii. 2; 7. Ps. i. 1—iv. 5; 8. Eccles. xii. 8—Cantic. i. 8.

Nine pages of the New Testament: 1. S. Matt. xxvii. 64—xxviii. 20; 2. S. Mark i. 1—35; 3. S. John xxi. 1—25; 4. 2 Cor. xi. 32—xiii. 5; 5. 2 Cor. xiii. 5—Gal. i. 17; 6. 2 Thess. ii. 17—Heb. i. 7; 7. Acts xxviii. 17—31; 8. James i. 1—ii. 6; 9. Apoc. ix. 5—x. 8.

Then follows a page containing the end of the Apocalypse with the beginning of the Epistle of Barnabas, and the first two columns of the Shepherd of Hermas.

These last two portions are very interesting, as supplying the hitherto lost Greek of these ancient documents. It will be remembered that there was produced a short time ago by the notorious Simonides, a Greek text of Hermas, which was printed at Leipsic; but great suspicion was entertained about its genuineness. It will be seen from Professor Tischendorf's letter, at the beginning of this article, what the relation of the texts is.

At the end of the little volume is a very beautiful facsimile

of a page of the MS., from which we may see the character of the letters and the mode of writing.

But though this Sinaitic MS. transcends in value all else that has been discovered, it is by no means the one and only result of the Professor's researches. He subjoins a list and description of treasures which, but for their brightness paling before this great discovery, would have excited considerable interest among scholars. i. 12 Palimpsests; ii. 20 Uncial Greek MSS.; iii. 18 Cursive Greek; iv. 9 Syriac; v. 11 Coptic; vi. 7 Arabic; vii. 9 Hebrew; viii. 2 Samaritan; ix. 3 Slavonic; x. 11 Abyssinian; xi. 5 Armenian; xii. 2 papyrus rolls with a Greek astrolabe.

It would be tedious to enumerate these MSS. in detail, but we may specify that the two Samaritan MSS. are of the Pentateuch, and very ancient. An enumeration of some of the twenty Greek uncial MSS. may give our readers an idea of what such treasures are:—

1—6. Fragments of six MSS. of the New Testament, written in the sixth and seventh centuries; being respectively, two leaves, six, six, one, one, and half a leaf in extent.

7. A Codex of 350 leaves, in small 4to. The Four Gospels, almost entire; written, apparently, in the middle of the ninth century. Tischendorf gives some instances of its readings.

8. Some more portions of a copy of the Four Gospels, fragments of which he obtained in a former journey, and sold to the Bodleian Library. The portions previously found contained the Gospels of S. Mark and S. Luke, nearly entire; five fragments of S. Matthew, and two of S. John. He has now found the rest of S. John, and all S. Matthew, except 150 verses. It is marked Γ in Professor Tischendorf's New Testament, ed. 7, and was written A.D. 844.

9. A Lectionary (or select portions read as lessons) of the Old Testament, of the ninth century.

10. Fragments of a Lectionary of the New Testament, written towards the close of the ninth century.

11. Six leaves, and two still to be detached from the binding of one of the other MSS., containing portions of the Homilies of S. Chrysostom, of the eighth century.

12. One leaf of some Patristic treatise, written in the ninth century.

13. One leaf, containing Jerem. ii. 2—12, of the ninth century.

14—20. Minor fragments, not worthy of enumeration.

Lastly, Professor Tischendorf informs us that he paid a second visit to Patmos, and there obtained a MS. of some books

of Diodorus Siculus; and he instances a case of one lacuna in the common editions, which it supplies; also a MS. of Origen's Scholia on Proverbs, more complete, apparently, than any which was known before. These he prints in the publication before us, pp. 76—122. It would, however, be foreign to our main object to enter upon any more detailed examination of them.

Those who take an interest in the criticism of the Greek Testament, are already under the deepest obligations to Professor Tischendorf for the indefatigable labour he has bestowed, first in collecting, then in editing, so many original documents relating to the sacred text. He has now added one more obligation, greater, perhaps, than all that have gone before; and if the Codex Sinaiticus is found to answer to his sanguine expectation, we may well follow his pious example in giving thanks to the Great Head of the Church, Who has, by his instrumentality, called up from the immediate neighbourhood of 'Horeb, the Mount of God,' one more witness to the genuineness and the integrity of that written Word, to which it pleased Him to commit, by the Holy Ghost, His lively oracles of truth for the guidance and the comfort of the Church, 'even unto the end of the world.'

NOTICES.

AMONG the Gift-books of the season, which are now becoming a regular branch of Art manufacture, we are able to signalize Mr. Longman's sumptuous publication, the new edition of Miss Winkworth's 'Lyra Germanica.' As most of our readers are aware, this is a selection from the popular and vast collection of hymns published by the Chevalier Bunsen. At the time of its publication it was so fully reviewed, that we are now chiefly concerned with it as a work of art rather than a theological manual. Mr. Leighton is an artist of considerable powers, yet of decided mannerism: and we must say that we prefer the artists who are associated with him. Some really fine single figures of Saints are introduced, and two bas-reliefs of Flaxman are beautifully drawn. Mr. Armitage, whose free drawing is somewhat cramped by the scale required for book illustrations, contributes, among others, a fine subject of Dives and Lazarus. Where, as in this case, the volume consists of the productions of different parts of different periods, a variety both in style and feeling is allowable in the illustrators; otherwise we should have preferred a single work illustrated throughout by a single hand, as in the old days of Smirke's Don Quixote. It ought to be noticed that the 'Lyra Germanica,' though falling below the tone of our own 'Christian Year,' contains, as far as we have seen, little, if anything, inconsistent with sound doctrine; so that we can recommend it as safe in essentials, while unquestionably it is among the most beautiful in execution of the collection of Christmas Books.

We are glad to see the Christian Knowledge Society taking a leaf out of the popular book. Several of its publications are really beautiful; and being cheap in price yet tasteful in execution, take a good place in the contest of gift-books. We desire to specify two little square volumes, one on *Butterflies*, and one on *British Sea Weeds*, both of them as creditable to the draftsman as to the scientific writer.

Among Almanacks we must award the prize for cheapness and for variety in style and binding, and what they call *mise en scène*, to the same Society's old-fashioned 'Churchman's Almanack.' It may be had in every variety of form—for the vestry, for the schoolroom, for the cottage, for the pocket; in cover, out of cover; on a sheet, on roller; for adults, for children—and at prices, sizes, and dress according. While for general information, and with a larger aim, Messrs. J. H. Parker's 'Churchman's Companion' maintains its high character. It is now published with special and local information of great value adapted to different dioceses.

Mr. Secretan's 'Life of Robert Nelson' (Murray) is a solid piece of biography which has another value than that of being, as it is, the most complete biography of an English layman, distinguished at once by sincere

piety, inflexible integrity, and, which is even rarer, by prudence and judgment in difficult ecclesiastical circumstances. Mr. Secretan has produced a picture of a period which it is the fashion to disparage; but, even were the lesson nowhere else taught, this excellent volume shows that the eighteenth century was remarkable in producing institutions which more than anything else have contributed to the stability of the Church of England.

One controversy is condensing into itself all the elements of evil; that controversy is on fundamentals. It is Scripture that we have to defend; and on every ground, both of internal and external evidence. As was to be expected, on Churchmen alone will be the burthen and heat of the day. What zeal there is in those who affect exclusively Evangelical pretensions is expended—and, as far as it goes, properly—on the poor. But it seems to be forgotten, or it is convenient to forget, that with the gradual and not very slow deterioration which is coming over the clergy, the circle of those who have either time or abilities to defend the citadel of the Gospel is lessening; and some day we shall awake to the fact that while all our energies have been expended in planting in the lowest ranks of society, through the Church's men and the Church's means, the fanaticism of the conventicle by revivals and theatre sermons, we have lost the intelligence, the education, and the literature of England. Especial credit, then, is due to those who attempt to keep up the learning of the Church, and who, alive to the signs of the times, feel that a true knowledge of Scripture is the best weapon against that peculiar phase which popular unbelief now assumes. The attack upon Scripture is best met by the exposition of Scripture. First, of course, now as always, Dr. Pusey flies to the weakest part of the wall. His 'Commentary on the Minor Prophets,' part of a greater work, ought not to be simply announced in this place. But to announce it is to ensure the gratitude of the Church.

In the same direction, Mr. William Denton, a London clergyman, has published the first volume of 'A Commentary on the Gospels for the Sundays and Holy-days' (Bell and Daldy), reaching from Advent to Easter. This is a volume of great value and research. Mr. Denton's plan is simply practical, and he takes the thoughts of commentators and homilists just as they present themselves, regardless of critical and merely literary questions. His object is a very plain one—to get the best thoughts on Scripture from every available source, from every writer of every age. His diligence in reading does the author great credit; his skill in joining together his materials into a whole shows the artist. The Church by its selection of the Gospels aims at a doctrinal unity; and following out this principle, Mr. Denton has been enabled to avoid what really is distracting in a consecutive commentary on the whole of Scripture. In point of fact, the Commentary becomes under this method a doctrinal treatise.

Delamotte's 'Primer of Illumination' (Spon) is the best introduction we have seen to an art which is popular, and which, for purposes of church decoration, ought to be studied, if practised.

Mr. Murray has given us a book which all Churchmen will value, in a

collection of the late lamented Professor Blunt's Essays to the world. They originally formed contributions to the 'Quarterly Review.'

A third edition of 'Olshausen on the Gospels' attests the interest which is felt among us in the writings of one of the best school of German theologians, while it does credit to the indefatigable spirit of Messrs. T. and T. Clark, the publishers of this and so many works of foreign divinity.

The age of giants is not extinct. The 'Letter to the Rev. Rowland Williams, by the Bishop of S. David's' (Rivingtons), is one of the most admirable specimens of controversial writing we ever saw. It more than recalls the manner of Bentley. For force and clearness of argument, for dignified indignation and reproof, for pellucid beauty of style and moral force, and for all that befits a reply to a most unscrupulous opponent, this letter deserves to be studied as a model.

To Miss Yonge's large circle of admirers we need only pronounce 'Hopes and Fears' a favourable example of her powers. The story is characterised by the brightness and fancy which, in her best efforts, give a charm to ready observation, solid sense, and high principle. It is happy in its heroine: Phœbe establishes herself at once in our favour, always does the right thing, and is equal to every emergency, thus inspiring that sense of trust and repose so agreeable in fiction. She is good without being dull; and being more an actor than a talker, there is a definiteness in all that concerns her which makes her appearance on the scene always welcome. In contrast with her simple straightforwardness, we have a flirt, evidently a very careful study, who illustrates the truth, to which we fully subscribe, that '*fastness*' quenches all high aspirations; but the effect on the reader thus admitted into motives and impulses is to throw a doubt on fascinations which are assumed to be irresistible. The character of Owen, who falls a prey to modern laxity of opinion, is open to criticism. We sometimes question whether the authoress quite knows what an irreclaimable *mauvais sujet* he would be regarded in real life. The honest, harsh Anglo-Catholic, Robert, perhaps, as coming within her experience, is a truer portrait. The aim of the story is to contrast modern thought and modern education with the religious influences of the last generation, which is done in an intelligent and candid spirit. Miss Fennimore, the sceptical yet conscientious governess, is in a line new to the writer, but drawn with considerable success. It becomes almost a matter of course, in commenting on the social literature of our day, to ask for greater distinctness, terseness, and point in the dialogue. We ought never to have to turn back to recal the subject under discussion. Young readers bring an unburdened attention to a story, and grudge no time or trouble where their interests are engaged; but we are all sensible of a change in this respect as we grow older, and this change should never be forgotten by those who write for maturer minds, the class for whom many parts of 'Hopes and Fears' are evidently designed by the thoughtful and accomplished authoress, and who can best judge of their truth and value.

M. Réville, a French Protestant Pastor, and President of the Dieppe Consistory, has put forth certain 'Lettres sur l'Eglise Anglicane' (Paris:

Grassart), which originally appeared in the 'Union Chrétienne,' and which were called forth by an eulogistic notice in that journal of the French translation of Bishop Jebb's 'Peculiar Character of the Church of England,' published by the Anglo-Continental Society. M. Réville does not recognise the Bishop's work as a faithful exposition of Anglican principles; and his object in these Letters, which he considers of such immense value as to think them worth republishing, is to undeceive the readers of the 'Union Chrétienne,' likely to be led astray by the good Bishop's book, and to show Frenchmen generally what the Church of England really is. When we state that M. Réville's learned dissertations are borrowed from the 'Church Parties' of one whom he calls Dr. Conybeare, from the Archbishop of Dublin, from Bishops Hind and Fitzgerald, from Dr. Arnold, and Mr. Gorham,—that he considers these, and not Bishop Jebb, as fit expounders and representatives of Anglicanism,—and when we further add that M. Réville assures the readers of the 'Union Chrétienne' that the works of the present Bishop of Bristol are lying on the table before him at the very time he is writing, and that he is quoting from them, and moreover that Mr. Newman at the time of his secession 'quitta son nom de docteur Newman pour prendre celui de *Père Ignace*,' our readers will form an idea of the qualifications, natural and acquired, of the President of the Dieppe Consistory for the task he has spontaneously undertaken. But the actual existence of a Bishop of Bristol is not the only discovery made by M. Réville. He announces in his first Letter (p. 2) that the XXXIX. Articles of Religion 'A qui se lisent dans le *Book of Common Prayer*'—of which curious Prayer-Book M. Réville had of course a copy before him at the time he wrote, as he had of the present Bishop of Bristol's works—'are preceded in that same Prayer-Book by the Articles drawn up by the Convocation held in London in 1562, and followed by the twenty-one Homilies, which have been added on to those published in the reign of Edward VI.'!! This is the person that volunteers to enlighten foreigners on the doctrine and position of the Church of England! Really M. Réville's eyesight seems as strangely affected as his recollections. In one respect, however, we quite agree with M. le Pasteur Réville. It is when he says that a person would fall into a great mistake, who should place Bishop Jebb on the same footing as M. Réville's own 'excellent ami—le docteur Whately.' M. Réville's Letters abound with many similar *naïvetés*, but we refrain from giving more.

The Abbé Lacordaire's 'Sainte Marie-Madeleine' (Paris: Poussielgue-Rusand) has very much puzzled French critics. It has been asked whether it is intended as a history, or a panegyric, or an appeal in favour of the restoration of the holy places where S. Mary spent the last thirty years of her life, or what it is. Without professing to solve the question, we shall give a short account of the work. It is a curious book. It opens with a dedication to Provence, of which a short description is given. This is followed by a chapter entitled, 'De l'Amitié dans Jésus-Christ;' then comes the Scripture narrative of the chief acts in the life of S. Mary, 'Des amitiés de Jésus-Christ au bourg de Béthanie;' 'De la première onction de Jésus par Marie de Béthanie, autrement Marie-Madeleine;' 'De la seconde

onction de Jésus par Marie-Madeleine;' 'De Marie-Madeleine à la croix et au tombeau de Jésus.' The author next relates her arrival, accompanied by Martha and Lazarus, at Marseilles, of which Lazarus became the first bishop; he then follows her to Aix, and then to Sainte-Baume, where she continued thirty years, and where, according to popular tradition, she was daily and seven times a day caught up miraculously to the top of the mountain, at the foot of which was the grotto where she lived, and there, like S. Paul, heard unspeakable words which it is not lawful for man to utter. 'Trente ans,' says her biographer, 'Dieu donna ce spectacle à ses 'anges pour en laisser le souvenir à tous les siècles. Trente ans Marie-'Madeleine passa de la pénitence à la gloire et de la gloire à la pénitence, 'réunissant dans cette alternative la double vie qu'elle avait eue, celle de 'pécheresse et celle d'amie de Jésus. Au fond de sa grotte, derrière une 'grille vénérée, s'élève un roc où la tradition rapporte qu'elle priait, et qui 'seul, dans ce lieu partout humide, conserve une pieuse et incorruptible 'sécheresse. Au dehors, sur la saillie abrupte et la plus haute de la montagne, 'mais un peu à gauche de la grotte, est le point marqué par la tradition 'comme celui où Madeleine était enlevée chaque jour. Une chapelle 'appelée le Saint-Pilon, en consacre le sol et y attire la vénération des 'pèlerins.'—(P. 172.) M. Lacordaire next gives an account of S. Mary Magdalene's death, of her burial, of her tomb, of the honours paid to her relics; and he describes very graphically the different places of the neighbourhood where he says she lived. In his account of the acts of S. Mary, Lacordaire has avowedly followed the Abbé Faillon's 'Monuments inédits sur l'Apostolat de Sainte Marie-Madeleine en Provence;' but the commentary is of course his own, and some parts of it are very touching and beautiful, though it must be acknowledged that in some places, 'l'amour divin parle le plus ardent langage de l'amour profane.' We perceive that the author of the work before us considers Mary Magdalene and Mary the sister of Lazarus to be the same person. We perceive also that he makes our Lord's first appearance after His resurrection to have been to S. Mary Magdalene, and not to the Blessed Virgin,—a proceeding for which he has been severely rebuked by extreme ultramontanist critics. We perceive further that the French of the new Academician is not always such as the Académie sanctions. For instance we read: 'C'est que dans ce jeune 'homme tout pâle encore des faiblesses de l'enfance, et tenant néanmoins 'd'une main virile la tête sanglante d'un ennemi vaincu, Jonathas a deviné 'le héros, et que David, en voyant le fils de son roi se pencher vers lui, 'sans jalousie de sa victoire et sans orgueil *du* rang, a reconnu dans ce 'mouvement généreux un cœur capable d'aimer, et digne par conséquent *de* '*l'être*.'—(P. 38.) Again: '*L'homme* n'aima plus comme il avait aimé. 'Seulement il emporta de ce premier amour dans les fanges de son exil un 'souvenir qui le suivait partout; et quand le Fils de Dieu vint pour le 'sauver, nul *d'eux* ne s'étonna que l'Evangile fût un livre d'amour, et 'l'amour le livre du salut. . . . Il a aimé comme on n'aimait plus, et, *entre* 'tant d'amitiés dont il nous a restitué le secret, *j'en* veux indiquer *une* dont 'aucune trace ne se retrouve avant lui.'—(P. 41.) The *d'eux* in the last sentence but one reminds us of Racine's own similar celebrated blunder in 'Athalie':—

'Promettez sur ce livre, et devant ces témoins;
'Que Dieu sera toujours le premier de vos soins;
'Que, sévère aux méchants, et des bons le refuge,
'Entre *le pauvre* et vous vous prendrez Dieu pour Juge;
'Vous souvenant, mon fils, que, caché sous ce lin,
'Comme *eux* vous fûtes pauvre, et comme *eux* orphelin.'

The Abbé Guettée, the learned author of the 'History of the Church of France,' and editor of the *Union Chrétienne* and of the *Observateur Catholique*, has just completed an 'Histoire des Jésuites' (Paris: Huet) in three goodly octavo volumes. We have not had time to read the work through, but judging from a cursory perusal of portions of it, we feel bound to say that the author—considering the systematic persecution he has experienced for years from the Jesuits and their confederates, and considering too that the subject of his History afforded full scope for the exercise of his remarkable powers of cutting satire and indignant invective—seems to have treated many questions *brûlantes* with great moderation and dispassionateness. That it should be an able work is what one expects from the Abbé Guettée.

'La Papauté en présence de l'Evangile et de l'Histoire' (Paris: Dentu) is not one of the least remarkable—whether we consider the quarter whence it proceeds or the nature of its contents—of the many hundred pamphlets called for by the present ecclesiastico-political state of certain portions of the Continent. The author examines the dogma of the Pope's supremacy by the light of Scripture and Primitive Antiquity, and concludes against it. Whilst he acknowledges that the Pope is the first of Patriarchs —that is, first in order not in place—and that by the Canons of the Church Catholic he enjoyed precedence among Bishops—he denies that he is the visible head of the Church, or Christ's vicegerent upon earth; titles, he says, which are opposed to the Gospel, and which have never been recognised by the Church; he repudiates the doctrine of Papal infallibility, and asserts that the Council of Trent was not an œcumenical council. The author is moreover a strong opponent of the Pope's temporal sovereignty, which he regards as fraught with evil to religion; and in this respect he goes much farther than the author of 'Le Pape et le Congrès,' whom he takes to task, and he would even deprive the Pope of the city of Rome itself, and of the melancholy satisfaction of enjoying the *culte des ruines*, which the author of the above-named pamphlet so considerately left him. The *brochure* before us has had, we understand, a large sale; it is evidently the production of a well-read and able Gallican. As far as its theology is concerned, it might almost have been written by an Anglican.

M. de Fresne, ex-Councillor of State, and translator of 'Cicero's Letters,' and of 'Manzoni,' has published a French edition of the Archbishop of Canterbury's 'Evidence of Christianity,' under the title of 'Divinité du Christianisme' (Paris: Giraud). The translation is nervous and elegant, though, judging from a hasty comparison of a few passages with the original, somewhat free. Some sentences here and there, bearing upon the errors of the Church of Rome, have, with the Archbishop's sanction, been omitted in the French edition. In one or two places we have noticed

that the translation is scarcely correct, and calculated to mislead foreigners. For instance, we read in the English :—'I find a *maintenance* for ministers 'who teach, explain, and *enforce* it [Christianity], making it part of the 'constitution of the State.' This is rendered by M. de Fresne : '*Le trésor* '*public* entretient les ministres qui l'enseignent, l'expliquent et la *défendent ;*' while just below '*maintenance*' is again translated '*allocations de l'Etat.*' This is true in France, but not in England ; and M. de Fresne's translation is likely to lead his readers into the belief that the English Clergy are paid by the State. We also perceive several mistakes in the reprint of the Archbishop's short letter to the translator, which is prefixed to the French edition, and is expressive of the author's acknowledgments to M. de Fresne for undertaking the translation—uncourteous, addressed, allways, lord Jesus-Christus. We trust these defects will be rectified in a second edition, which we shall be glad to see.

M. Emile de Bonnechose's well-known work, 'Jean Hus, Gerson et le Concile de Constance,' has reached a third edition (Paris : Cherbuliez). To this edition the eminent author, who is brother to the Bishop of Evreux, has added a short but remarkable Preface which will well repay perusal.

Mr. Richard Tudor has thrown some lectures, originally delivered in the parish church of Helston, into the form of a Treatise on 'The Decalogue, viewed as the Christian's Law ; with special Reference to the Questions and Wants of the Times' (Macmillan). Mr. Tudor writes earnestly and reverently, and he has not shrunk from dealing with very difficult and thorny questions, such as The Unity of the Church—The Commination Service—The Athanasian Creed—The Sabbath—Suicide—War—Divorce—The Prohibited Degrees of Marriage—Equivocation—Simony. The volume constitutes a thoughtful application of the principles involved in the Ten Commandments to the circumstances of the present day.

The 'Workhouse Orphan' (Hatchard) is a warm-hearted appeal in behalf of the unhappy children of honest labourers, who, on the death of their parents, are suddenly, and from no fault of theirs, thrown into that receptacle for all the bad characters of the district—the workhouse. The terrible effects of the present workhouse system upon the characters of the orphan children brought up within the workhouse walls are depicted forcibly and truly. The remedy proposed is the institution of Homes, supported in part by voluntary contributions, in part by aid from Government or from the Board of Guardians of the district, in which these orphan children may be gathered into quasi-families. One such Home does already exist, 'realizing all the expectations hopefully anticipated.' This is the Brockham Home and Industrial Training School, the object of which is 'to take girls out of workhouses, chiefly orphans, between the ages of 'twelve and sixteen, to train them in all kinds of household work for 'domestic servants, as well as to provide a Home for them, to which they 'may return when out of place from no misconduct of a serious kind.' The end proposed by the writer, and the manner in which she advocates it, are alike commendable.

A volume of Sermons, by Mr. West, of Wragby (Masters), strikes us as being a collection of sound and judicious discourses.

We are disposed to think that much harm will be done to the Church cause by exaggerating the extent and value of what is called reaction at the present moment. A vast many clergymen and some few laymen are disposed to think that the decreasing majority in favour of the total abolition of Church rates and the ignominious failure of Lord Ebury's motion betoken a large and permanent change in public opinion. The Church is no longer in danger. The great Conservative party was never so strong as at the present moment; and Mr. D'israeli has hoisted the banner of No surrender. Such is the language in many quarters. We beg to offer a very cautious distrust of these flattering anticipations. Thanks to the Emperor Napoleon, the patriotic spirit of the country has been revived; the national cry of England and English institutions has throbbed through the national heart. Now, the Church is an institution, and in common with all other institutions at the present moment it is looked at under Conservative auspices. But the reaction is a political, not a religious one. It is quite true that for the moment it disposes of some immediate difficulties. That we have got Bishop Philpott and not another Bishop Waldegrave, is, we believe, due much more to the Rifle Corps than to any ecclesiastical reaction. It is our earnest counsel, therefore, to Churchmen not to relax an iota of their defensive policy. It was much more owing to the inconvenient out-spokenness of the Liberation Society than to the awakened consciences of ratepayers that the defeat of Sir John Trelawny's bill is owing; and so it seems likely to be with Lord Ebury's motion. Most fortunately the advocates for revision are doing our work. Whether we look to the insolent vulgarity of the 'Ingoldsby Letters' (Partridge and Oakey), or to the dull but outspoken heresy of the Rev. Philip Gell in his 'Thoughts on the Liturgy' (Wertheim), or to the conceited imbecility of Mr. E. S. Kennedy, 'A. B. Cantab.' in his 'Liturgy and the Laity' (Hatchard), it is certain that literature of this sort can only tell one way. But it may be that the Revisionists will be wiser at their next attempt, and will march under an abler leader than Lord Ebury; and that they will have the prudence to recommend silence to indiscreet pamphleteers like those we have specified. The Declaration of the 10,000 Clergy to be worth anything means, at least so we interpret it, that from every parish of every one who signed it a petition will be ready at the very first attempt to renew Lord Ebury's motion.

THE

CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER.

APRIL, 1861.

ART. I.—*Ueber Tammūz und die Menschenverehrung bei den alten Babyloniern.* Von D. A. CHWOLSON. (On Tammūz and the Worship of Men among the Ancient Babylonians. By D. A. CHWOLSON.) S. Petersburg. 1860.

IN a former number of this Journal,[1] we noticed at some length Dr. Chwolson's 'Remains of Ancient Babylonian Literature in Arabic Translations.'[2] A work of such scope and character, professing to upset many favourite and long-received hypotheses, and to establish as facts what must appear to many to be wild and fantastic assertions, was sure to call forth much severe criticism; and accordingly we find it reviewed, with more or less hostility, by Ewald (in the *Göttingische gelehrten Anzeigen* for 1859 and 1860), Renan (in the *Revue Germanique*, tom. x. 1860), and Spiegel (in one of the numbers of *Das Ausland* for 1859). Whether the promised review by Fleischer and von Gutschmid has yet appeared, we are not aware; but we can inform our readers that it is Chwolson's intention to reply at length to the objections raised by these scholars, as soon as he can find the necessary leisure. Meantime, he abides by the results announced in his 'Ueberreste,' and, on the whole, we are inclined to think that he is in the right. It appears to us that we really have here a work written by a Babylonian, Ḳūthāmī by name, who lived about the end of the fourteenth century before Christ. Like all Oriental works, this book has been extensively interpolated by successive editors, and corrupted, designedly or undesignedly, by more modern, especially Moḥammedan, transcribers.[3] No one can be surprised at this who is acquainted with

[1] Vol. XXXIX. No. cviii. April, 1860.

[2] Ueber die Ueberreste der altbabylonischen Literatur in arabischen Uebersetzungen. S. Petersburg, 1859.

[3] Chwolson mentions two curious and instructive instances that occurred under his own eye. A Moḥammedan, whom he employed as amanuensis, could not bring himself to write the words الهنا الشمس, '*our* God the sun,' but substituted الهم الشمس, '*their* God the sun;' and a Christian Arab from Aleppo,

the textual condition of Arabic or classical authors, and reflects that even sacred Scripture itself has not wholly escaped the same fate; nor is any one more ready to admit it than Chwolson himself. Ewald, therefore, is not warranted in describing him as maintaining that these interpolations amount to no more than 'a single word or a short sentence here and there.' We believe them, with Chwolson, to be numerous and sometimes not inconsiderable; and we believe, too, that they are due not merely to the translator, Ibn Waḥshīya, and his pupil, Abū Ṭālib ez-Zaiyāt, who edited his translation, but still more to previous rédacteurs and transcribers, who successively revised the book, and modernised its language and phraseology. Hence the appearance, for example, of the Neo-platonic *Agathodæmon* (اغاثاذيمون), the mention of the *Pahlawī* names of plants, and the like. At all events, the question of the age and authenticity of the 'Nabathæan Agriculture' cannot be settled by a mere reference to a few words and phrases, admitted or supposed to be modern. The character and self-consistency of the book, as a whole, is a point of much greater weight in making our decision. So far as we can judge from Chwolson's account of its contents, and from the numerous extracts he has given, the author nowhere contradicts himself, or speaks otherwise than we might expect from one writing at the period alleged. He pretends to be a native of Babylon, living under the rule of a foreign Canaanitic dynasty; he depicts the splendour and glory of the city in his time; makes mention of its temples; describes the customs and religious ceremonies of nations long extinct even at the commencement of our era; speaks of religions, hitherto unknown to us, with a lively feeling of partisanship; expresses his fear that the then prevalent doctrines of Ishīthā would gain a yet wider extension, and become the dominant creed among the Nabathæans; and all this without anywhere letting fall a single syllable to show that he was acquainted with, or had even heard of, Judaism, far less Christianity. Such being the case, we can hardly believe that this is all the skilful forgery of a comparatively modern impostor; that Ibn Waḥshīya was imposed upon, and has in his turn imposed upon scholars and critics like Quatremère and Chwolson.[1]

finding it stated in the *Nabathæan Agriculture*, that the عيد ميلاد الشمس, or 'festival of the nativity of the sun,' was held on the *twenty-fourth* of the first Kānūn, coolly altered the date into the *twenty-fifth*, because, as he said to Chwolson, he, being an Eastern Christian, knew quite well that the عيد الميلاد (*the festival of the nativity*, i.e. Christmas) was celebrated on the twenty-fifth of that month!

[1] Quatremère, from the study of a mere fragment, ascribed the 'Agricultura Nabathæorum' to the age of Nebūchadnessar.

What a strange history is that of this book! The Arab translator knew of but the one manuscript from which his translation was made, and which we may suppose to have somewhat resembled in appearance another codex unicus that he describes elsewhere, consisting of a thousand leaves of parchment (الرقّ) of large size, written in a beautiful and correct hand. Having finished his task, he did not dare to give the fruit of his labours to the world, through fear of religious intolerance and priestly persecution; but left his translation to a favourite pupil, to be published after his death. Of this translation, only some half-dozen manuscripts have survived the wear and tear of nine or ten centuries; one of which is fortunately complete, whilst the others are fragments of greater or less extent.[1] And to how few, except Arab writers, has its value been known! Maimonides, who cites it in the دلالة الحائرين (better known by the Hebrew title מוֹרֶה נְבוּכִים), is, we believe, the only Jewish writer who has made use of it; whilst to European Orientalists it first became known, in 1835, through Etienne Quatremère, but never received the study it deserved till Chwolson's attention was directed to it in the course of his researches regarding the Ṣābians.

It is to be regretted that Chwolson has not yet commenced the publication of the Arabic text of the *Agricultura Nabathæorum*, accompanied by a French or German translation; and we fear, from what he says in the treatise *Ueber Tammūz*, at p. 104, that a considerable time ('eine ziemlich geraume Zeit') must yet elapse before he does so. Meantime, let students and critics occupy themselves with the careful and dispassionate study of the portions he has already communicated to us in the *Ssabier*, the *Ueberreste*, and the later work which we have placed at the head of this article, and of which we now propose to give some account to our readers.

Whilst the prophet Yeḥezḳēl (Ezekiel) was dwelling in exile in Mesopotamia, and the elders of Judah sat before him in his house, the hand of the Lord fell upon him, and brought him in a vision to Jerusalem, and showed him the idolatrous rites practised in the very temple of Yahve (Jehovah) by the apostate Jews. Amongst other abominations, we are told (chap. viii. 14): וַיְבִא אֹתִי אֶל־פֶּתַח שַׁעַר בֵּית־יְהוָה אֲשֶׁר אֶל־הַצָּפוֹנָה וְהִנֵּה־שָׁם הַנָּשִׁים יֹשְׁבוֹת מְבַכּוֹת אֶת־הַתַּמּוּז, 'And he

[1] The missing portion of the Leyden manuscript 303, *a*, *b*, has at last been discovered by the exertions of Mr. de Goeje, the Adjutor interpretis legati Warneriani at the University Library, and is now in Dr. Chwolson's hands.

brought me to the entrance of the gate of the house of Yahve, which is towards the north; and see, there were the women sitting bewailing Tammūz.' The words present no difficulty to the translator; the only question is, who was Tammūz? why was he bewailed by the women? and why is this stigmatised as an abomination in the sight of God?

The ancient versions, with the exception of the Vulgate, give us no information on the first of these points. The oldest Greek translation, commonly called the Septuagint, simply has: *καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐκεῖ γυναῖκες καθήμεναι θρηνοῦσαι τὸν Θαμμούζ*; the Chaldee version: וְהָא תַמָּן נְשַׁיָּא יָתְבָן מְבַכְּן יַת תַּמּוּזָא; the Syriac Peshīṭto: ܘܗܐ ܬܡܢ ܢܫ̈ܐ ܝܬܒ̈ܢ ܡܒܟ̈ܝܢ ܠܬܡܘܙ; and the Arabic: وَاِذَا هُنَاكَ نِسْوَةٌ جَالِسَاتٌ يَنْدُبْنَ تَمُوزَ. The Vulgate, however, renders the passage by: *et ecce mulieres sedentes plangentes* ADONIDEM, thus identifying Tammūz with Adonis. Among the Fathers of the Church this view is supported in particular by Jerome (in his Commentary on Ezekiel), and Cyrill of Alexandria (on Isaiah, ch. xviii.); and it is also current among Syriac writers, though the silence of Afrēm (Ephraem) Syrus is remarkable. The Jewish commentators, on the other hand, are full of extraordinary notions on the subject. Most of them take the *pi"ēl* participle, מְבַכּוֹת, not in an intensive meaning (*bewailing*), but in a causative sense (*making weep*), and then treat us to some strange stories that have their origin apparently in the derivation they ascribe to the word תַּמּוּז. Rabbi Shelōmō Iṣḥāḳī (Rashi), for example, who is pleased to derive תַּמּוּז from אָזָא, *to kindle, to heat*, infin. מָזָא, gravely tells us that Tammūz was an image with eyes of lead, which the women heated within till the lead melted, and so gave the idol the appearance of weeping, a sign, they said, of its requiring an offering! Rabbi Shelōmō ben Abrāhām Parḥōn is still better instructed. According to him, Tammūz was an idol in the shape of a worm, which the women placed on the surface of the water; and the water, getting into its interior, ran out at the eyes, so that it seemed to weep. Maimonides, to be sure, citing as his authority the *Agricultura Nabathæorum*, tells us that Tammūz was a man who called upon a certain king to worship the seven planets and twelve signs of the zodiac, and was cruelly put to death by him; that the images of the gods assembled from all quarters of the world in the temple at Babylon, listened to his story as narrated by the great golden idol of the sun, and bewailed his hard fate; and that

hence originated the festival celebrated by the heathens on the first of the month of Tammūz, in commemoration of his melancholy end. 'Ridicula fabula,' says Œcolampadius, in whose judgment modern critics have generally concurred.

In recent times, three different views have found support. The majority of critics, including such as Rosenmueller (Scholia, tom. vi.), Gesenius (Lexicon Manuale), Maurer (Comment. in Vet. Test.), Creuzer (Symbolik und Mythologie), Umbreit (Praktischer Commentar ueber den Hesekiel), Winer (Biblisches Realwoerterbuch), Movers (Die Phœnizier, Bd. I.), Ewald (Die Propheten des alten Bundes, Bd. II.), and Roediger (in his continuation of Gesenius' Thesaurus), hold fast by the traditional explanation of *Adonis*. The last-named scholar, for instance, says:—

'תַּמּוּז, c. art. הַתַּמּוּז, *Tammûs*, n. pr. numinis Phoenicum, quod a Graecis Romanisque vocabatur *Adonis* (i.e. אֲדוֹנִי) et a mulieribus Hebraeis quoque planctu solenni colebatur, cujus rei testis est Ezech. viii. 14: וְהִנֵּה שָׁם וגו׳, *et ecce ibi* (ad portam templi borealem) in visione spectavi *mulieres sedentes* et *lugentes Tammûsum* s. Adonidem. LXX. Θαμμούς. Adonidem explicabant Cyrill. Alex. in Jes. 18 et Hieron. ad Ezech. l.c., Vulg. Adonis. Idque verum est, quicquid contra dicat Benfeyus (Monatsnamen p. 164 sqq. 173), et mensis Tammûsi תַּמּוּז, ⟨ⲑⲱⲙⲟⲩⲑ (i.e. mensis a novilunio Julii incipientis) nomen Syris recentioribusque Judaeis usitatum sine dubio cum cultu illius dei connexum est. . . . . Etymon quaerenti respondeo, sine dubio vocem תַּמּוּז, si modo est semitica, ad rad. טָמַן = טָמַם referri contractumque esse ex תְּמוּמוּז (cf. תְּמוּרוּד a rad. מָרַר), quod non pavorem vel pavidum interpretor, ut volebat Gesenius, sed diffluentiam, i.e. dissolutionem, decessionem s. *ἀφανισμὸν* Ἀδώνιδος cum Haevernickio comment. in Ezech. p. 112.'

Another theory that has found many supporters is, that the name and worship of Tammūz is of Egyptian origin, and that he is identical with Osiris. This is the opinion, for example, of the great Orientalist de Sacy (in his notes on St. Croix, Recherches sur les Myst. du Paganisme, 2d ed., t. ii. p. 101), of Hug (Ueber den Mythus der alten Welt, p. 87), and of Hitzig (Der Prophet Ezechiel, p. 61), whose words we quote:—

'Zu den Ephraimiten war dieser Cultus einst ueber Syrien gekommen (Sach. 12, 11); nach Jerusalem gelangte er, wie der Name hier an die Hand giebt, *von Aegypten direct*. Aegyptische Koenige heissen Θούμμωσις, Θμῶσις, Θαμοῦς (Joseph. geg. Ap. 1, 14. 15. Plato Phaedr. p. 274); Ταμώς ein Aegypter, der persischer Statthalter und Navarch wurde (Thucyd. 8, 31. Xenoph. Anab. 1, 4. § 2); Θαμοῦς nennt *Plutarch* (de def. oracc. 17) einen aegyptischen Steuermann. Tammuz ist der Adonis-Osiris, welchen *Steph. Byz.* (s. v. Ἀμαθοῦς) nach Aegypten heimweist.'

The third view, which is upheld by Benfey and Stern, in their work *Ueber die Monatsnamen einiger alten Vœlker*, is, that the name of Tammūz is derived from the so-called Zend or ancient Bactrian language, and that his worship is connected with the religion of Zarathustra (Zoroaster) and, in particular

with the Persian festival *Farwardyān* or *Farwardgān* and the month *Farwardīn*. The name of this month in Zend, according to Benfey, is *fravashayo daenayāo* scil. *mazdayaçnois*, and we are required to believe that a contraction of these last two words, *daen. mazd.*, was gradually corrupted into *Tammūz!* We need not add that Benfey's idea has found but little favour among Biblical critics, who usually pass it by with the silence it deserves. But are the other two opinions one whit more tenable? We are far from adopting the extreme views of Engel, who, in speaking of this very matter (Kypros, Bd. II. p. 623), asserts that the authority of the Fathers is of value only when they narrate simple matters of fact, and that no class of writers is less capable of passing a sound judgment upon myths and strange religions; but it seems to us that neither Jerome nor Cyrill makes any pretence to certainty in his identification of Adonis with Tammūz. The exact words of the former are: 'Quem nos Adonidem interpretati sumus, et Hebræus et Syrus sermo *Thamuz* vocat;' and of the latter: 'Exponitur autem Thammuz Adonis.' There is nothing in these expressions to warrant us in believing that they knew anything more than, till very recently, we ourselves did regarding Tammūz, namely, that a festival was held in his honour, at which he was publicly lamented by women, who are the chief mourners on all solemn occasions in the East. But is this enough to identify him with Adonis? We think not. Such celebrations are common enough in all heathenish religions, and the passage in Ezekiel leaves us quite in the dark as to whether any joyous festivities were connected with this period of mourning for Tammūz, or not. And again, supposing we take for granted the identity of Adonis and the Egyptian deity Osiris, does it follow that, because of a certain similarity in sound between the names of Tammūz and Θμῶσις, &c., this latter is substantially the same with Adonis and Osiris? Surely we are entitled to demand some better evidence, before Hitzig can expect us to believe in the three-headed monster, Tammūz-Adonis-Osiris.

So then we find ourselves once more at the point whence we started. All that we really know regarding Tammūz is contained in Ezek. viii. 14. The rest is mere conjecture, based in part on Hebrew etymologies that are open to doubt, if not clearly erroneous; in part on Egyptian names, the meaning of which we do not always know, and for the correctness of which we cannot always positively vouch. To be sure, there is the story told by Maimonides, which finds a certain degree of support in the worship of Tammūz among the *Mendā'ites*, the modern descendants of the ancient Nabathæans or Babylonians (Norberg, Liber Adami, tom. iii. p. 178, l. 12 sqq.) But, unfortunately,

the Jewish scholar's statement is very fragmentary, the work from which it was taken (till very recently) wholly unknown, and the authority of Jerome and Cyrill too great to be easily overset; so that, as we have seen above, his narrative has usually been deemed a ridiculous fable.

It has been reserved for Chwolson, the discoverer, as we may say, of the *Agricultura Nabathæorum*, to clear up this point satisfactorily; and we now proceed, as proposed, to give an analysis of his interesting work.

A Christian Arab, Abū Sa'īd Wahb bin Ibrāhīm, who is frequently cited by Moḥammed bin Isḥāḳ in his famous cyclopædia the *Fihrist el-'olūm*, makes the following statement, in his calendar of the Ṣābian festivals, under the month of Tammūz (Chwolson's Ssabier, Bd. II. p. 27):—

'On the fifteenth of this month is the *'īd el-būḳāt*, i.e. the festival of the weeping women, which is identical with *Tā'ūz*, a festival held in honour of the god *Tā'ūz*. The women weep over him, (telling) how his Lord slew him, and ground his bones in a mill, and scattered them to the winds; and they eat (during this festival) nothing that has been ground in a mill, but only soaked wheat, vetches, dates, raisins, and the like.'

That this *Tā'ūz* (تاؤز, i.e. تَاءُوز) is the same as *Tammūz* is rendered certain by the whole tenor of Abū Sa'īd's statement, as well as by the fact that some of the Kurdish tribes at the present day call the month in question by the name of Tā'us (تاوس). It appears, therefore, that Tammūz, though said by our author to be a *god*, had a superior lord, for whom there is no place whatever in the Adonis-myth. Moreover, the manner of his death is wholly different from that of Adonis, and there is no mention made of any joyous festivities, like those of the εὕρεσις or ἀνάστασις Ἀδώνιδος. In short, the two festivals seem to have had nothing in common, save the weeping women, on whose presence no stress can be laid, since hired females are the chief mourners on all melancholy occasions in Oriental countries. There is, however, one seemingly important discrepancy between this account and that of Maimonides cited above; namely, that Tammūz is here said to be a *god*, whilst the Jewish writer represents him as a mere *man*. That a Christian, witnessing the reverence shown by the Ṣābians to this personage, should speak of him as a god of subordinate rank who had over him a superior lord, can be no matter of surprise; but the two statements admit, as we shall hereafter see, of being reconciled in another way. Let us turn to the source from which Maimonides derived his information, and examine what is there said regarding Tammūz.

Ḳūthāmī, the Babylonian, who lived some thirteen hundred

years before Christ, and whose principal work was translated into Arabic by Ibn Waḥshīya in the year 904 of our era, writes as follows:[1]—

'The contemporaries of Yanbūshādh (ينبوشاذ)[2] assert that all the *sekā'in* of the gods, and the images (of the gods), lamented over Yanbūshādh after his death, just as all the angels and *sekā'in* lamented over Tammūzī (*or* Tammūzā).[3] The images (of the gods), they say, congregated from all parts of the world to the temple السكول[4] in Babylon, and betook themselves to the temple (هَيْكَل = הֵיכָל) of the sun, to the great golden image that is suspended between heaven and earth in particular. The image of the sun stood, they say, in the midst of the temple, surrounded by all the images of the world. Next to it stood the images of the sun in all countries; then those of the moon; next, those of Mars; after them, the images of Mercury; then those of Jupiter; next, of Venus; and, last of all, of Saturn.[5] Thereupon the image of the sun began to bewail Tammūzī, and the idols to weep; and the image of the sun uttered a lament over Tammūz and narrated his history, whilst the idols all wept from the setting of the sun till its rising at the end of that night. Then the idols flew away, returning to their own countries. They say that the eyes of the idol of Tihāma (in South Arabia), called *Nesr* (the Eagle), are flowing with tears perpetually, and will always continue to do so, from that night in which it lamented over Tammūz along with the image of the sun, because of the particular share that it had in the story of Tammūz. This idol called Nesr, they say, is the one that gave the Arabs the gift of divination (el-kihāna, from كَاهِن, *a soothsayer*, = כֹּהֵן), so that they can tell what has not yet come to pass, and can explain dreams before the dreamers state what they are. They (the contemporaries of Yanbūshādh) tell (as follows). In the same way, too, the idols in the land of Babel bewailed Yanbūshādh singly in all their temples a whole night long till morning. During this night there was a great flood of rain, with violent lightning and thunder, and a tremendous earthquake (in the district) from the pass of Ḥolwān[6] to the banks of the Dijla (Tigris), near the city of Nehārwāyā,[7] on the eastern bank of that river. The idols, they say, returned during this flood to their

[1] The whole passage is given in Arabic and German, by Chwolson, *Tammūz*, p. 41 sqq. Our translation differs slightly from his in some passages, in which he has, as we think, misapprehended the original.

[2] He lived, according to Chwolson's calculation, from four to five hundred years before Ḳūthāmī.

[3] We are not quite certain what is meant here by the word *sekā'in* (سكائن). According to Chwolson it denotes a particular class of *angels*. Grammatically, the word is the plural of سَكِينَة, = שְׁכִינָה.

[4] The pronunciation and meaning of this name are alike uncertain. See Chwolson's *Ueberreste*, p. 102.

[5] It is remarkable that the order of the planets, as here enumerated, is identical with that of the Roman days of the week.

[6] Reckoned, in Ḳūthāmī's time, the eastern boundary of Babylonia.

[7] The orthography of this name is not quite certain, but two MSS. have in several places distinctly نبارواليا. Ibn Waḥshīya identifies it with Bagdād, or, more strictly, he says that it occupied the space from Bagdād to el-Medā'in (Ctesiphon or Seleucia, at the present day the ruins called *Ṭāḳ Kisrā*).

places, because they had been moved from them a little. They brought on this flood, they add, merely as a punishment upon the people of the land of Babel on account of their having abandoned the dead body of Yanbūshādh, as it lay on the bare ground[1] in the desert of Shāmāṣ, so that the flood carried his dead body to the wādī 'l-Aḥfar, and then swept it from this wādī into the sea.[2] And there was a drought and a pestilence in the land of Babel for three months, so that the living were not able to bury the dead. These tales (proceeds Ḳūthāmī) have been collected, and are read in the temples after prayers, and the people weep and lament much thereupon. When I myself am present with the people in the temple,—in particular on the festival of Tammūz, which is celebrated in the month called after him,—and they read his story and weep, I weep along with them always, out of friendly feeling towards them, and because I compassionate their weeping, not that I believe what they narrate of him. But I believe in the story of Yanbūshādh, and when they read it and weep, I weep along with them very differently from my weeping over Tammūzī. The reason of this is, that the time of Yanbūshādh is nearer to our own than the time of Tammūz, and his story is, therefore, more certain and worthy of belief. It is possible that some parts of the story of Tammūz may be true, but I have my doubts concerning other portions of it, owing to the distance of his time from ours.'

So far Ḳūthāmī. The details given by him are supplemented by the translator, Ibn Waḥshīya, who proceeds as follows:—

'Says Abū Bekr Aḥmed ibn Waḥshīya. This month called Tammūz, according to what the Nabathæans say, as I have found it in their books, is named after a man, of whom a strange long story is told, and who was put to death, they say, several times in succession in a most cruel manner. Each of their months is named after some excellent and learned man, who was one, in ancient times, of those Nabathæans that inhabited the land of Babel before the Chaldæans (*el-Kasdānīyūn* = הַכַּשְׂדִּים).[3] This Tammūz was one neither of the Chaldæans, nor the Canaanites (*el-Kan'ānīyūn*), nor the Hebrews (*el-'Ibrānīyūn*), nor the Assyrians (*el-Jerāmiḳa*), but of the primeval Janbānīs (*el-Janbānīyūna 'l-auwalūn*).[4] And in like manner, say they, all their months are named after men of past

---

[1] Chwolson has: 'während diese (die Leiche Janbûschâds) sich in 'Urâ in der Wüste Schâmâç befand.' He reads بالعرآء, and connects this name with that of the دجلة العوراء or part of the Tigris below el-Baṣra, commonly called the *Shaṭṭ el-'Arab*. We have preferred reading بالعرآء; عرآء, *'arā*, denotes in Arabic 'land that is bare of trees or shrubs.'

[2] *Shāmāṣ* may, as Chwolson thinks, be identical with the more modern *esh-Shemmāsīya*, and the *wādī 'l-Aḥfar* may designate the low land around el-Baṣra, or more towards the sea. Ḳūthāmī tells the same story elsewhere with additions. The body of Yanbūshādh is said to have been carried by the waves to one of the islands in the Persian Gulf, where scented plants grew, and to have been preserved there undecayed till the time when he was writing. His townsmen, the people of Ṭizenābād, however, maintained that Yanbūshādh had been taken up to heaven without dying, like Dewānā'ī.

[3] This is the usual form of the national name in the *Agricultura Nabathæorum*. The form الكردانيون, or perhaps rather الكزدانيون, also occurs; but never الكلدانيون.

[4] The orthography of this last name is not quite certain, owing to the wretched state of the Arabic MSS.

times. The first and second Tishrīn are called after two brothers, who were distinguished in the sciences; as are also the first and second Kānūn. Shebāṭ (or Shubāṭ) was the name of a man who married a thousand women that were virgins without begetting any children; and so, on account of his want of offspring, they made the month of Shebāṭ the last of their months, and curtailed the number of its days. All the Ṣābians of our time (proceeds Ibn Waḥshīya), whether Babylonians (Mendā'ites) or Ḥarrānīs, down to our own day, wail and weep over Tammūz in the month of that name, on the occasion of a festival in his honour, and make a great lamentation over him; especially the women, who all arise, both here (at Bagdād) and at Ḥarrān, and wail and weep over Tammūz. They tell a long and silly story about him, but, as I have clearly ascertained, not one of either sect (Mendā'ites or Harrānīs) has any certain information regarding Tammūz, or the reason of their lamenting over him. However, after I had translated this book (the *Agricultura Nabathæorum*), I found in the course of my reading the statement that Tammūz was a man concerning whom there was a legend, and that he had been put to death in a shameful manner. That was all; not another word about him. They know nothing more about him than to say: "We found our ancestors weeping and wailing over him in this way at this feast that is called after Tammūzī." My own opinion is, that this festival which they hold in commemoration of Tammūz is an ancient one, and has maintained itself till now, whilst the story connected with him has been forgotten, owing to the remoteness of his age, so that no one of these (Ṣābians) at the present day knows what his story was, nor why they lament over him.'

Ibn Waḥshīya then goes on to speak of a festival celebrated by the Christians towards the end of the month of Nīsān, in honour of S. George (جورجيس), who is said to have been put to death several times in succession by a king whom he summoned to become a Christian, and to have come to life again after each slaying. He points out the great similarity of this legend to that of Tammūz (هي قصة تموز بعينها), and concludes by saying:—

'This is what I found regarding him (Tammūz) in 'the Agriculture;' but after that I lit upon another Nabathæan book, in which the legend of Tammūz was narrated in full; how he summoned a king to worship the seven (planets) and the twelve (signs of the Zodiac), and how the king put him to death, and how he still lived after being killed, so that he had to put him to death several times in a cruel manner, Tammūz coming to life again after each time, until at last he died; and behold, it was identical with the legend of S. George that is current among the Christians.'

These extracts are long, but interesting. Ḳūthāmī, writing for his own people at a period when Babylon was in the height of her splendour, enters into no particulars regarding Tammūz; the legend was too well known to everybody at that time to need repetition. From what he says, however, it appears that, according to written legends which were read in the temples after prayers, the death of Tammūz was bewailed in the temple of the sun at Babylon, not only by the gods of the land, but also by foreign deities, such as the Arabian Nesr, as well as the *sekā'in* and the angels; and that this practice was continued

down to Ḳūthāmī's own day in commemoration of that personage. There is nothing in all this to convince us that Tammūz was not a *god*, the more so as he is actually so designated by the above-cited Abū Sa'īd. But the matter assumes another aspect when we observe that he is placed on a level in every respect with *Yanbūshādh*. Now Yanbūshādh is to Ḳūthāmī a perfectly historical character; he is no god or demigod, but a man who led a solitary, ascetic life, in prayer, fasting, and good works. He was a scholar as well as a devotee, occupied himself with investigating the laws of nature, and wrote many scientific works, chiefly of an agronomic character. Hence he came to be regarded as a prophet and a saint; and though he was a determined opponent of the prevalent doctrines of star-worship, and suffered much persecution on that account, yet a temple was erected to him during his lifetime, in which a statue of him was set up. After his death many wonderful tales were told concerning him, and, as we have read above, his followers asserted that his body had been swept out to sea by a flood, and carried to an island in the Persian Gulf, where it was miraculously preserved from decay, this being (as we shall afterwards find) in the eyes of the Babylonians the highest reward of a holy and pious life. Some even maintained that he had, like the biblical Enoch, been taken up to heaven without tasting of death. Legends regarding him were read in the temples along with those concerning Tammūz, and he was mourned by the assembled congregation in a similar manner. Hence we are warranted in concluding that Tammūz was nothing but a man like Yanbūshādh, but belonging to a much earlier epoch; for Ḳūthāmī, who is far from being of an irreligious turn of mind, could persuade himself to believe but little of what was told regarding him. We must observe, moreover, that the above passages distinctly show that the lamenting of Tammūz was *not confined to women*, though they naturally took a conspicuous part in it, and that not a syllable is said of any *joyous festivity* such as was the finding of Adonis.

The remarks of Ibn Waḥshīya are not less curious than the narrative of Ḳūthāmī. Firstly, we learn from him that Tammūz belonged to a period antecedent even to the Chaldæan. He was one of the ancient Mesopotamian race of the Janbān (الجنبان), regarding whom, unfortunately, we possess at present no information. Secondly, we have here a new account of the origin of the names of the Babylonian and Syrian months, which have hitherto defied investigation; for, since the decipherment of the cuneiform inscription of Behistūn, Benfey's derivation of them from the Zend language can no longer be admitted. There is nothing absurd, hardly even improbable, in the state-

ments of Ibn Waḥshīya on this point. Every one knows that some of the Roman months are named after historical personages, and why not then the Babylonian? Besides, had Ibn Waḥshīya invented these details out of his own head, he would have made *Adār* (March) the last month of the year, for it is expressly stated in several passages of the *Agricultura Nabathæorum*, as well as in the Ṣābian calendar cited in the *Fihrist el-'olūm*,[1] that the Babylonian new year's festival was held on the first of *Nīsān* (April); or he would have followed the reckoning of the Syrian Christians, who commenced their year with September or October, and in later times with January. But, instead of this, he presents us with a system of reckoning closely resembling that of the ancient Romans, in which March was the first month of the year, and *February the last*.[2] These apparent discrepancies are perfectly reconcileable on the supposition that the Babylonians had, like several other nations of antiquity, a double year, a civil and a religious. With the Jews, for example, the civil year commenced with Nīsān, the religious with the first Tishrī;[3] and similarly, as it would appear, the ancient Babylonians commenced their year, according to our calendar, with *Adār*, or March, according to another, with *Nīsān*, or April; whilst the religious year of the Ḥarrānīs dated from Nīsān, and their civil year from Tishrī.

Whether the martyrdom of Tammūz, as related by Ibn Waḥshīya, and pronounced by him to be identical with the Christian legend regarding the martyrdom of S. George, be the same as the story read in the temples of Babylon in the time of Ḳūthāmī, is what we are not in a position to affirm, owing to the unfortunate silence of the latter. But this much at least is clear, that Tammūz was, according to Babylonian tradition, one of the first preachers of planet-worship; that he suffered martyrdom for his religious opinions, was reverenced as a saint by his followers, and a yearly festival held in his honour, at which he was publicly lamented by all who believed in his doctrines. That *women alone* participated in the observances of the festival of Tammūz, and that the period of mourning was succeeded by one of *rejoicing*—of these things neither Ḳūthāmī nor Ibn Waḥshīya says anything; and what becomes then of the identification of Tammūz with Adonis? To us at least it seems to be cut up by the roots.

That Tammūz is called by later writers a *god*, and that the Mendā'ites had a temple erected to him in which he was wor-

[1] See Chwolson's *Ssabier*, Bd. II. p. 23.
[2] See the remarks of Movers in Chwolson's *Ssabier*, Bd. II. pp. 781-3.
[3] See the interesting note of Chwolson on this whole subject in his *Ssabier*, Bd. II. pp. 175 sqq.

shipped,—these facts in no way contradict the account of him given above. For, in the first place, we may cite the evidence of Ibn Waḥshīya himself, who says that neither the Ḥarrānīs nor the Mendā'ites knew anything regarding Tammūz, not even why they lamented him. And, secondly, it can be shown, on the evidence of '*The Agriculture*,' that the existence of temples to Tammūz is no proof whatever of his being a *god*, in the common acceptation of the term. It seems, on the contrary, to have been the practice of the Babylonians to erect temples in honour of individuals who were distinguished for their piety and other virtues, or for their influence as lawgivers and founders of religious sects. In these temples their statues were placed and festivals celebrated in memory of them; in short, they were worshipped with divine, or almost divine honours; nay more, they were actually called *the gods of their epoch*. As a parallel, we may cite the case of Augustus and other Roman emperors, who were deified and received divine honours; but it is best to let the *Agricultura Nabathœorum* speak for itself.

Yanbūshādh, then, who is for Ḳūthāmī a perfectly historical personage, is represented as having had a temple and statue erected to him even during his lifetime, and as having been placed after his death on a level in point of sanctity with Tammūz. But a yet older prophet and lawgiver than he was similarly adored; we mean Dewānā'ī, who is spoken of in such terms as 'the lord of mankind,' 'the noble lord,' 'the gracious father,' 'the philosopher of philosophers and the wisest of the wise,' &c. His writings, or at least books ascribed to him, chiefly on astronomical, meteorological, and agricultural subjects, are repeatedly cited by Ḳūthāmī, and even Ibn Waḥshīya had in his possession a work said to be by Dewānā'ī, which he began to translate, but left unfinished, owing to its bulk.[1] During his lifetime his fame as a saint and prophet extended far beyond his native land, and his authority was acknowledged both among the Jerāmiḳa, or Assyrians, and in Syria, in which country he found an opponent in one Mardāyā'ī.[2] Ḳūthāmī does not profess to give many particulars regarding Dewānā'ī, owing to his great antiquity, but what he does communicate is all of interest. In one passage in particular, quoted by Chwolson (*Tammūz*, p. 70), he informs us that the Nabathæans used to burn some of their dead, not all of them, according to

[1] The title of it is given in Arabic as follows: اسرار الفلك والاحكام علي الحوادث من حركات النجوم, *The Secrets of the Heavens and the Prognostication of Events from the Motions of the Stars.*

[2] Or Mardāyād (مردايا or مردايا).

rules laid down on the subject; but Dewānā'ī put a stop to this practice altogether, and taught them to construct urns of clay, baked in the fire, in which the dead bodies were deposited and then buried. These particulars show that Dewānā'ī was, in Ḳūthāmī's estimation, not a god, but a man; and yet he speaks in clear unambiguous words of Dewānā'ī's temple in Babylon, containing his statue, which was worshipped with divine honours. He was once, he tells us, in this temple, attending the festival in honour of Dewānā'ī, and when the statue was unveiled, the whole congregation prostrated themselves before it, with the exception of one man of rank, a follower of Ishīthā, who pretended that his nose was bleeding, and remained standing. This gives Ḳūthāmī an opportunity of inveighing against the doctrines of Ishīthā and his followers in bitter terms.

As a fitting conclusion to this article we will translate the principal portions of a long extract quoted by Chwolson from the *Agricultura Nabathæorum*, which shows to what extent this worship of saints and sages prevailed in Babylon, and what idea lay at the root of it.

In the chapter on the plant *fennel*, called in Persian رازیانج, *rāziyānaj*, or رازیانه, *rāziyāna*; and in Chaldee برهلیا, *barhilyā*, or بزهلیا, *bazhilyā*, Ḳūthāmī writes as follows:—

'This is one of the plants regarding which the followers of Ishīthā, the son of Adam, peace be upon them both,[1] say that Adam brought it from the land of the sun,[2] and introduced it into the land of Babylon; and on this account, say they, they named it by one of the names of Jupiter, namely Bazhilyā (*or* Barhilyā).[3] They think that if a person eats the weight of a dirhem of its seed, with the like quantity of white sugar,[4] daily, from the day of the sun's entrance into the head of Aries, till the day of his entrance into the head of Cancer, and continues this practice every year, he will never fall sick, and will attain the utmost limit of natural life with a healthy body, retaining his senses in all their strength and perfection, till he reaches the extreme limit possible for a human being, and dies. If a person, say they, feeds himself with it all his life, that is to say mixes some leaves and seeds of fennel with his victuals, and habitually eats it, it makes the odour of his body after death so pleasant, that no offensive smell at all is perceived from it, such as is perceived from the dead bodies of animals; just as

[1] These words are doubtless interpolated by Mohammedan transcribers, who also altered the name of *Adamī* (or *Adamā*) into *Adam*.

[2] 'The land of the sun' lay, according to the *Agricultura Nabathæorum*, south of India, from which it was separated by a desert. Chwolson thinks that by *India* Ḳūthāmī means the *Panjāb*, in which case the desert would be the *Marusthala* or desert of Rājasthān, southwards from the Panjāb, and 'the land of the sun' would correspond to the Dakkhan or Deccan.

[3] The gods of Babylon had, like the Grecian and Roman deities, great and mysterious names, by which they were addressed on particular occasions with special effect.

[4] Sugar is often spoken of in '*The Agriculture*,' the thirty-second chapter of which work treats of the preparation of one sort of it from the tree called '*oshar*' (العشر, Asclepias gigantea).

if (remarks Ḳūthāmī) they thought that the body became sweet-scented through a man's eating it constantly whilst alive. This is very likely to be the case (continues he), for we have seen persons in our own days, and have heard of others in past times, from whose bodies no bad smell was emitted after their death. Amongst these are some whom I do not wish to name, since the mass of the Chaldæans are of a different opinion regarding the cause of the sweetness of their bodies after death, and reckon it an effect of the influence of the moon and Jupiter, and not the result of any regimen they adopted during their lives. Now as regards Yanbūshādh, Ibrāhīm,[1] Felyama[2] en-Naharī, and myself (i.e. Ḳūthāmī), we think that this may be produced in the dead body by a certain procedure during life, namely, by mixing fennel with one's food in a particular manner, so that the constitution becomes accustomed to it, and the body is nourished with nourishment that contains in it the virtues of fennel.[3] But as regards Ḍaghrīth, he thinks that this (viz. the absence of putrefaction after death) and other similar circumstances which are witnessed after death, and during life too, are nothing else than gifts of the gods, and not the result of any human contrivance or acts; that the turning aside of things from their usual course cannot be accomplished or take place, except they be turned aside by a god that is able to do so; that no natural objects can be made to undergo any change as to their substances and natures by any human contrivance or arts whatsoever; and that none can effect this save a god that is wise and perfect in power and might. Men, however (says he), imagine at times that things can take place, without there being the least truth in their imaginations; and one of these is, that they can make the body sweet after death and during life too, so that one shall not perceive an offensive smell from anything that passes out of his body, neither urine, blood, excrement, vomit, nor sweat; and, when he dies, there shall not be smelled from his corpse the odour that is perceived from the dead bodies of all animals. They think, too, that this can take place and be effected by a contrivance during life, namely, by introducing a certain thing into their bodies among their food, and by employing something in a regular and progressive manner. But all this is in my (i.e. Ḍaghrīth's) opinion sheer nonsense, destitute of the smallest proof or evidence. This can be attained only by good works and acts of devotion, constant offerings, calling upon the gods by their beautiful and great names, watching by night and fasting by day; for then the gods, or that one of them in whose honour these acts of devotion, sacrifices, and good deeds are performed, produce in that person a sweetening of his body and of what issues from it, and he becomes such as were Adam (Adamī) and those who preceded him, Dewānā'ī, 'A'āmī, Sūlīnā (*or* Sūlīmā), ... ,[4] Ṭūlūnī (*or* Ṭūlū'ī), Resā'ī, Kermānā, and others, whom Ishīthā, the son of Adam (Adamī), has enumerated, and of whom he says that they were pure, being purified by good works and by their admirable exertions to draw near to the gods. They spent their lives therein, and attained unto the gods, besides obtaining what they sought in respect of the sweetening of their bodies, so as not to emit the bad smells that proceed from dead animals. And the gods exalted them above all men, and made them conspicuous among them through this, and gave them a preference over them,

[1] This name has been corrupted by Moḥammedan copyists from its original form ابروهوم, *Abrūhūm*, which has been preserved in one MS., accompanied by the obscure surname بالامس, *Bālāmas*.

[2] Or Ḳalnāmā (قلنامًا or فليامًا).

[3] Here follow in the original directions for this treatment.

[4] Here stands a name which we cannot decypher, owing to its being written in all the MSS. without diacritical points, اسدمدا or اسدمدا.

that their (the gods') power might be evident, and that (other) men might be incited to perform similar works, and to persevere in them; and that they might be during their lifetime honoured, exalted, and feared, (other) men seeking to be cured by them,[1] and striving to gain a blessing by looking upon them, and dwelling where they dwelt. And after their deaths it became apparent that their bodies were honoured by being freed from all similarity to human things, and thus men were made aware that this power was manifested in them after their death, in order that they might act like them. The beginning and the end of this work (the attainment of the condition of these holy men) consists in this —that men should turn away from their lusts and the following after them, and should restrain their souls from the pursuit of what they desire, and should walk according to the walk of the revered angels, who strive to resemble in their walk the moon, which in its turn strives to imitate the sun; and so they live a great while, as long as nature can aid them with the power which the gods have given. After this their bodies are honoured by being made sweet, and by all bad smells, impurities, and dirt being removed from them. And herein they are classed according to their different degrees in good works. From the body of one, after his death, the gods remove the offensive smell, but the body decays, and out of the portion of dust into which this body is converted, something results which it would be tedious to tell.[2] To him who has attained a higher degree than this in good works, the gods give the same sweetness of body, and preserve his body so that it does not decay for a considerable time (which is longer or shorter), according to his works. If his degree in abundance of works and perseverance in good be yet higher than the last, they preserve his body after death for ever, without its decaying at all or changing, or its form altering by putrefaction in any way; so that people can see him after his death entire, as they see images of gold, and silver, and solid stone, which never decay or alter. In regard to this body that lasts in spite of time, we (Daghrīth and his followers) and others see in it an example of the great care that the gods have for this world and what it contains, and of the beneficence with which they assist mankind; for we think that when the cycle of that god commences,[3] who preserved the dead body sound and uncorrupted, he resuscitates it by giving to it again a spirit like his own (the god's) spirit, and makes it dwell in the body, and joins to it a portion of his own light; and so the person becomes a god to the people of that age. His condition in death, after the lapse of the period which he is destined to attain, is like his former state (during his first death); he dies, but his body remains as it remained before, until the same god's cycle recurs, and he does for him again as he did before. This is repeated through all time, unless the person deviates from the like of his former good works, and from the restraining of lust and passion; in which case the god deprives him of this act (no longer preserves his body and revivifies it), and he dies a painful and evil death, and is annihilated and becomes dust. But if he walks, each time that the god revivifies him, with the same walk for which he was thus rewarded, the god repeats this act; and so it goes on with him for ever and ever—he dies, comes to life again, and is a chief and a god, gracious and honoured, as long as he lives. On this point all our sects in all their subdivisions are agreed. The recompense of the gods, and their reward for those who obey them and strive to draw near unto them, by struggling against passion and following reason, and a walk like their own (the gods') walk, takes place in the manner and order above stated. What differs from this

[1] Or, according to another reading, 'making intercession through them when they wanted rain.

[2] Chwolson says that he has found no explanation of this passage in '*The Agriculture*,' or any other of Ibn Waḥshīya's translations.

[3] On the cycles of the gods, see Chwolson's *Ssabier*, Bd. I. pp. 705 and 766 sqq.

is the opinion of those only who deny the works of the gods, and do not know the measure of their benefits unto them. Such invent for themselves, in their unbelief and lies and shamelessness, different methods and ways, which they describe, all lying and foolish, and say that their cunning and dexterous inventions enable them to attain these ends, which only the living and everlasting gods can accomplish. This, however, is a lying opinion, and a feeble device, and a detestable dogma, rejected by those who know and believe. Says Ḳūthāmī: This is what Ḍaghrīth says here on this subject. He has stated his opinion and doctrine regarding it, and has brought forward arguments in defence of it. And this was likewise the doctrine of Ṭāmithrī the Canaanite, and of all the Canaanites, and Chaldæans, and other Nabathæan tribes, save a few, who have deviated from it, and said so plainly, like Anūḥā and Ibrāhīm (Abrūhūm Bālāmas), who bared their faces in opposition to it. I think that Yanbūshādh held the opinions of Anūḥā on this subject; for he preferred to regard the gods as (being in reality) one god, whom he placed above them all in power and government, so that he is he and there is no other but he.[1] He did not dare, however, to state this publicly, for fear of his life, and out of regard for his preservation.'

So much for Renan's theory of primitive Shemitic monotheism! We here see Anūḥā, Abrūhūm, Yanbūshādh, and Ḳūthāmī struggling, but in vain, against the dominant polytheism of the Nabathæans. We also learn from this passage a peculiar religious tenet, which was not confined to the Babylonians, but prevailed also among the Canaanites and other Aramaic peoples. The wicked, we are told, died; his body decayed, according to the ordinary course of nature; and there was an end of him. The body of the virtuous man, on the contrary, emitted no offensive smell after death; and though it gradually decayed, yet a sort of after-existence is dimly shadowed forth in the obscure passage which we have just translated. Higher degrees of virtue were rewarded by the preservation of the body from decay for a shorter or longer time; the highest of all by its preservation for ever. The holy men, whose bodies never decayed, were brought to life again when the cycle of the god to whose service they had especially devoted themselves once more came round; and each of these saints, gifted with a divine spirit and light, is expressly called

[1] This sentence is apparently corrupt. From other passages it appears that Yanbūshādh held that there was an Allāh or supreme God above all the other gods, even above the sun. Hence, instead of: كان يحبّ ويري ان يجعل الآلهة الٰها واحدًا ويجعله فوقها كلّها في القوّة والتدبير فيكون هو هو لا غيره we should probably read: كان يحبّ ويري ان يجعل فوق الآلهة الٰها واحدًا ويجعله فوقها كلّها في القوّة والتدبير فيكون هو هو لا غيره, and regard the words غيره, as interpolated by a Moḥammedan scribe.

'the god of his epoch.' They differ, however, from the real gods in this, that the latter are ever living; whereas the former, though they may be said to have an everlasting existence, live only when the cycles of their patron deities come round. At the expiration of a cycle they die, but their bodies remain undecayed till it recurs again, and are then revivified by the same deity. If, however, during any of these resuscitations the saint deviates from his holy walk and conversation, he shares the fate of other sinful men—he dies, and becomes a prey to decay and annihilation.

It can be no matter of surprise that nations holding such a creed should worship even *living men*, who were pre-eminent for their piety, learning, and good works, as *gods;* and such, Ḳūthāmī tells us, was the case at least with Ẏanbūshādh. It follows, therefore, that the term *god* among the ancient Shemites corresponded not only to *θεός*, but also to *ἥρως*; and we are entitled to regard 'hero-worship' as a characteristic feature of their religious creed, provided always that we distinguish carefully between the Indo-German hero,—conspicuous for his supernatural bodily strength and courage, or for his craft and cunning,—and the Shemitic hero,—a prophet, a saint, or a sage. The word seems even to be capable of a still wider signification, for Dewānā'ī, in a passage quoted by Ḳūthāmī (*Tammūz*, pp. 101, 102; *Ueberreste*, p. 91, note 179), speaks of the inhabitants of the land of Babylon as being 'gods to all mankind and 'mediators for them, just as the angels are mediators between 'us and the sun, and as the prophets and sages are mediators 'between us and the sun and between the angels and men, 'especially the people of this region.' Those writers are not therefore wrong, who, like Abū Sa'īd, speak of Tammūz as a *god;* whilst, at the same time, it is manifest, from all the details furnished by Ḳūthāmī and Ibn Waḥshīya, that he was an ancient Shemitic, or, it may even be, pre-Shemitic, hero or prophet, who died a martyr for the religion that he preached.

Such is an account, necessarily short and incomplete, of the latest results of Chwolson's studies in the *Agricultura Nabathæorum* and the other remains of ancient Babylonian literature. On their interesting character we need not further enlarge. Our object is to introduce them to the notice of scholars in this country, who may, by a careful and dispassionate investigation, help to separate what is ancient and authentic in these documents from what is modern and spurious, and so aid the cause of truth and learning, which the author has so much at heart.

ART. II.—1. *Why should we Pray for Fair Weather?* A Sermon Preached in Eversley Church, August 26th, 1860. By CHARLES KINGSLEY, M.A. Rector of Eversley, Chaplain in Ordinary to her Majesty, and Professor of Modern History in the University of Cambridge.

2. *The Limits of Exact Science as applied to History.* An Inaugural Lecture, delivered before the University of Cambridge. By the Rev. CHARLES KINGSLEY, M.A. Professor of Modern History in the University of Cambridge, Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen, and Rector of Eversley. Macmillan & Co. Cambridge and London. 1860.

WE have taken occasion in several recent numbers of this review to expose the shallowness of different writers of the Rationalist party in the Church of England. By a convenient fiction they are designated the Broad Church Party. The term has a liberal sound, and the especial grace which the party arrogates to itself is that of universal charity. They look for good and for truth wherever they are to be found, and in the process are content to overlook any amount of error that may be associated with them. Many of them are entitled to all the credit that is due to active exertions for the temporal welfare of their fellow creatures. Spiritual welfare will follow as a matter of course, and is otherwise a point scarcely worth attending to. But the one badge of the school is absolute and entire indifference to doctrine. They are gradually surrendering all the articles of the faith, sometimes explaining them away, sometimes denying them,—and thus act as the pioneers of that infidelity which is following close upon their footsteps. Mr. Kingsley is a prominent member of this school, and because he is so (for there is no other conceivable reason to be assigned for the appointment), he has recently been placed in the chair of modern history at Cambridge. The two publications placed at the head of this article, are the two first fruits of the appointment; or if it be thought unfair to connect the preaching and printing of a sermon, with the proper work of a professor of history, we will rather say that these are the two works by which we are fairly entitled to judge Mr. Kingsley's present system of philosophical and theological belief. His theological opinions may be seen in the sermon, his philosophical powers may be best estimated from the lecture.

And first for the sermon. Nothing could be more natural than the subject, 'Why should we pray for fair weather?'

The necessity of praying for it has, perhaps, never in the present generation been more apparent than in the late dreary year of incessant rain—of consequent failure of provisions, and dearness of prices. We should probably scarcely exaggerate the case at all, if we ventured to assert, that in no season of the present century have so many and such pointed allusions to the state of the weather, and man's dependence upon God's good pleasure for the necessaries of life, been made from the pulpit. For the few weeks which preceded the usual commencement of harvest time, as well as during the time when the corn was being cut, or when it ought to have been cut, the most gloomy anticipations prevailed. The agitation of the money market, and the gradual fall of all securities, were an almost certain index of hard times expected. And though it happened, as usual, that men's fears were proved to be exaggerated, by the results not being so disastrous as was anticipated, yet there was real distress enough to make people anxious and thoughtful; and probably the prayer for fine weather was heartily joined in by numbers, who never before in the whole course of their lives thought of making the weather a subject of prayer. The difficulty which always presents itself to a clergyman's mind as to the propriety of using the prayer, on the score of the case being clear enough to demand it, had scarcely any place on the present occasion; and we suppose that from nearly every parish church in the country, for three or four Sundays, this prayer was offered up with tolerable unanimity. What other exception there may have been to this we do not know, but the parish church of Eversley, we are told, was one; and the present sermon was preached to satisfy the parishioners as to why the prayer was omitted; and has been published that people may be acquainted with the views held by the Rector of Eversley on the subject of prayer in general, and of prayer for fine weather in particular.

As we have said, nothing could be more natural than the subject of the sermon at such a season. That the answer to the title of the sermon was obvious, was by no means an argument that the sermon was superfluous. A most admirable sermon may be made, which shall consist of nothing but what is obvious, trite, common-place, truistic; all that is wanted is, that common-place and obvious truths should be placed in a striking light, and should be forced home to the intelligence of the hearers. And thus, though the answer to the question, 'Why should we 'pray for fair weather?' could probably have been given by every peasant who heard the sermon, and would probably have run somewhat in this fashion, 'Because, please God, that is the way to get it;'—that is no reason why the question should not be asked, rather it is the best reason in the world why it should

be asked over and over again. We profess no quarrel, therefore, with Mr. Kingsley's subject. Neither, again, can we urge any objection against his text, which virtually contains the reply to the question. There are, perhaps, few more definite statements as to the efficacy of prayer in the whole of the New Testament; and certainly no invitation to prayer more gracious than that contained in the words in the Sermon on the Mount, 'What 'man is there of you whom if his son ask bread, will he give 'him a stone? or if he ask a fish will he give him a serpent? If 'ye then being evil know how to give good gifts unto your chil-'dren, how much more shall your Father which is in heaven, 'give good things to them that ask Him.' We should not be at all surprised to hear that the same text had been used in a considerable number of churches on the same day and on the same occasion, from which to enforce the duty of prayer in general, and to explain the use of the particular prayer for fine weather on this particular occasion. Mr. Kingsley's use of the text is somewhat remarkable. He employs it to fit the state of things which is described in the opening of his sermon, as follows:—

'The prayer for fair weather which has been read lately, I understand, in most churches, was not read this morning in this church. I think myself bound, my friends, to tell you why I have thought it better not to read it. I trust that you will listen to me patiently and fairly, and that even if some of you should not agree with me, you will still all give me credit for having thought over the matter carefully; and for wishing to say what is true and to do what is right.'—P. 3.

Under these circumstances our readers will not be surprised at being told, that there is scarcely a word in the sermon which alludes ever so remotely to the gracious argument of the text. If the text had had for its concluding words the exact contradictory of the statement, that 'in order to obtain we must ask,' which in our poor judgment appears to be its meaning; if it had told us that we need not ask, because God will give us without being asked, the sermon would have precisely fitted it. It is undoubtedly an awkward state of things when the contradictory of a given text would have suited our purpose better than the text as it stands. Mr. Kingsley has adroitly avoided this awkwardness, by making no allusion to this part of the text. We can only express our wonder, that he did not keep his text out of sight altogether, and if a sermon must have a text, we should have recommended him to choose one (not that suited his subject—that would have been impossible, but one) which should have less obviously and distinctly clashed with, and contradicted it.

The sermon then, instead of touching upon the efficacy of

prayer, its power to prevail with God, or its influence on the heart of him who prays, is entirely taken up with assigning two reasons why the Rector of Eversley did not think proper to read the prayer for fine weather, when fine weather seemed to be wanted. The reasons appear as two; but we are unable to see that they amount to more than one. The first reason assigned is, that we do not know that fine weather was wanted; the second, that the writer was afraid of being presumptuous. We have already said that the Rationalist school are not remarkable for the accuracy of their logic. Two reasons look more imposing than one, and that, we suppose, will account for Mr. Kingsley's representing as two arguments what is really one. It runs thus, and is simple and intelligible, however inconclusive it may be thought: 'We cannot tell whether fine 'weather is wanted; it would therefore be presumptuous to 'pray for it.' The premise is illustrated with a variety of considerations which occupy the first five pages of the sermon, whilst the last five pages are devoted to the expansion of the idea of presumption. With regard to the premise we have no objection to urge against Mr. Kingsley's profession of ignorance, 'I do not know that it is needed.' It would have been very strange if he, or his congregation, or anybody else had known for certain what kind of weather was best for themselves, and their neighbours, and the country at large. There is no conceivable subject of prayer, as regards physical things, of which we can judge absolutely for ourselves. We may, indeed, pray without reserve to be delivered from that which we know to be in itself, and absolutely evil; such things, for instance, as are enumerated in the first four petitions of the Litany; but as regards most of those evils from which we are taught to pray to be delivered in the next two petitions, we can form no judgment whether in any given case more good or harm will result from the request being granted or refused. The very fact, that the best of men have occasionally fallen victims to them, and that visible good on a large scale has frequently resulted from them, as for instance, from pestilence and famine—or even from sedition, privy conspiracy, and rebellion—is sufficient to show us that we know not how to pray aright for the commonest blessings; to convince us that it is as much the part of wisdom as it is of humility, to pray God to grant us our desires and petitions, so far as may be most expedient for us. If Mr. Kingsley had remembered that our petitions at church are always concluded with the form of prayer, said to be composed by S. Chrysostom, it might, perhaps, have relieved his mind of some anxiety as regards the use of the prayer for fair weather—for the doctrine apparently advocated in this part of the sermon,

and which is strangely inconsistent with the latter half, is, that God hears prayer and sometimes answers it; and the author is evidently very much afraid that it will be so in this instance. Now we cannot bring ourselves to believe that God will answer the prayers of His Church to His people's injury, so long as they unfeignedly and without reserve leave the issue in His hands, to do or not to do as He pleases. If Mr. Kingsley differs from us on this point, if he thinks that there is danger of God's granting the petitions of His people, when they themselves deprecate such grant, and refer themselves with all submission to His sovereign will and pleasure, then all the facts that he urges in support of his view are very pertinent and to the point. Nay, we will give the writer the benefit of all the evidence that has occurred since the time when he preached his sermon against prayer. It cannot be alleged that the prayer for fair weather has been successful as to its first intention. A wet summer has been followed by a wet autumn, and a wet autumn by the commencement[1] of a wet winter, and Mr. Kingsley is entitled to all the credit he likes to claim on the score of sagacity, when he propounds his opinion, that 'there is 'great reason to believe that these rains, over-heavy and hurt-'ful as they seem, are really a boon and a blessing.' He further proceeds to ask the question, 'And how do we know that these 'rains are not restoring to us many a wholesome influence of 'this kind which we should have wanted without them, that 'every shower which falls is not bringing down to us blessings 'as necessary for our health, as is the one blessing of grain 'which it may lessen? How do we know that they are not 'washing away, day by day, the seeds of pestilence in man, and 'beast, and vegetable, and sowing instead the seeds of health 'and fertility for us and for our children after us.' Now take this passage in conjunction with the late returns of the mortality in towns, which show that the answer to his questions is precisely such as to be most favourable to the result which the author would have wished. We must say, that we think it affords us a most pointed lesson as to the goodness of God, who knows what is best for us far better than we know ourselves, yet permits us, nay, commands us, earnestly to pray to Him, not only for those things which we are certain are for our good, but for that which we think will be for our good.

Most readers of this review will know that the average rate of mortality has been considerably diminished during the last few months, and though we are by no means entitled to consider this result as one of unmixed good, yet the fact renders it

[1] This paper was in type in December last, but was accidentally postponed.

extremely probable, that we have been saved by means of the late abundant rains from the evils of drought and pestilence. It is certainly an argument for thankfulness to Almighty God. We profess our entire inability to see in it any evidence that our prayers were either foolish or ineffectual.

We have no disposition to find fault with the physical description of the value of water, the extent to which it pervades every thing, and influences all things, or the mode in which rain is generated. Such description is in itself true, and, perhaps, was not out of place in a sermon preached to a country congregation. What we find fault with, is the relation in which the facts occur, and the conclusion which they are somehow or other brought to support—that we had better not pray for fair weather; but Mr. Kingsley has made a remarkable slip in the course of his argument, which we cannot pass over in silence.

The first part of the sermon deprecates prayer for fear it should be answered. The argument is, that the answer to prayer may do us harm, and therefore we had better take care what the subject of our prayer is. The possible mode in which harm may be done by cessation of rain, is fairly enough exhibited, so long as Mr. Kingsley confines himself to the statement of facts. The moment he touches upon argument he begins to flounder. The first argument he brought us was, that the granting of our prayer *may* be harmful. We had better, therefore, not pray. The next takes a further step and is more ambitious. It runs to this effect: that there is an average of rain which is kept up, not altogether year by year, but taking one year with another; that it is altogether natural, therefore, that in some one year, as for instance the present, which follows two or three very dry years, the rainfall should be above the average in order that the right balance may be kept up. 'Surely if we ask God not to restore the balance of rain, we ask him to do us harm and not good.' Now if the objection here were against prayer to God, in cases where physical phenomena are concerned, on the ground that they are unalterable—and prayer therefore useless, the difficulty though perfectly easy of solution, would be of a different kind; but Mr. Kingsley does not, in this part of his sermon, pretend any thing of this sort. Rather the ground taken is that our prayers may be heard and granted, and that the concession to our petitions *may* be or *must* be hurtful to us.

Mr. Kingsley's singularly philosophical view is, that physical phenomena are not determinate for each year, but that they are determinate when estimated over a long interval of years. We must be allowed to express our belief in a somewhat greater

amount of stability in the world of nature than Mr. Kingsley seems to admit of, and yet, as will be seen in the sequel, we can find room for the operation of the prayers whether of individuals or of Churches. But to take Mr. Kingsley on his own ground. Surely if things go wrong year by year, and are only righted by taking a long average of years—here is the very province of prayer. It is admitted that, taking the years singly, there is an imperfection which has to be set right by balancing the defect of one year against the excess of another. Where then is the absurdity, or where the impiety of praying to God to produce this average result with greater uniformity? How do we know that the very imperfection may not have been graciously intended to stir us up to pray to Him that he may be pleased to remove it? We do not enter upon the subject, how far God may be pleased, upon any occasion, to send a plague of rain and waters as a punishment for the sins of His people. Probably nothing we could allege on this subject would have much weight with Mr. Kingsley: but, perhaps, the exposure of the illogical style of his arguments may be useful to some of his readers. Accordingly, we leave the following passage to the religious sense of each reader to judge of it for himself.

'Shame would it be, if a country which has received and is receiving still, so many blessings from God, should suddenly lose heart and fancy that Almighty God had turned against it, because it has rained a few weeks more than usual this summer.'—P. 7.

Before we go on to notice the writer's second argument so called, we must make some allusion to Mr. Kingsley's pleasant method of dealing with texts of Scripture. We have already spoken of the text which is placed at the head of this sermon. There are but two ever so remote allusions to it in the whole sermon. We said above that the whole tone of the sermon is such as would have exactly fitted the conclusion of the text, had the concluding words been expressed as the exact contradictory of what they are. We now have to observe that the only direct allusion to the text which occurs in the sermon, is the following:

'Let us beware, then, lest while we fancy that we are asking our Father for bread, we are really asking Him for a stone.'—P. 8.

Now if this has any argumentative force at all, it means—'Take care how you ask for bread, lest you should get a 'stone?' which we suppose will be admitted to be almost *totidem verbis* the exact contradiction of the precept in the text which is made to depend upon the question—'What man 'is there of you whom, if his son ask bread, will he give 'him a stone?' The only other allusion to a text of Scripture

which occurs in this part of the sermon is introduced into the same argument, though how it bears upon the question at issue between Mr. Kingsley and his clerical brethren we are unable to see. 'And bear in mind my friends that man 'doth not live by bread alone, but by every word that pro-'ceedeth out of the mouth of God. By every word. By all 'the laws of nature which are words of God; by all of them 'put together and not by eating only is mankind preserved 'and enabled to multiply and prosper, and grow richer, wiser, 'better.' It is undoubtedly possible that 'every word that 'proceedeth out of the mouth of God' may be stretched to include the laws of nature, but if this process be adopted it would hardly seem possible not to include in its meaning the revealed commands of God. And as one of the most frequently repeated of these commands is to pray to Him for what we want, we should have thought the passage would have been more useful in defence of the practice of prayer than available in impugning it. However, perhaps the reader may be able to understand the relevancy of the text to the subject better than we can ourselves, and so we will give him the conclusion of the argument which it is brought to support, in the author's own words:

'How do we know that if these rains had not come this year the cholera would not have come instead? How do we know that in praying God to take away these rains we are not asking Him to send the cholera in the year to come? I am of opinion that we are. I think—I have thought long—that one or two more dry summers, keeping the springs at their late low level, would have inevitably brought back the cholera or some other kind of pestilence, but even if that particular guess be wrong, this I believe that every drop of rain which is falling now is likely to be not a plague and a punishment, but a blessing and a boon to England and to Englishmen.'—P. 9.

And now that his hearers or readers may be considered to have mastered his first argument, they are supposed by the writer to be in a condition to appreciate the second. 'Now 'perhaps you may understand better why I said that I was 'afraid of being presumptuous in praying for fine weather.' We do not know how far a congregation of country people may have been able, upon hearing the sermon preached, to detect the inconsistency of a preacher's dissuading them from prayer for fear it should be granted, and then telling them it would be presumptuous to pray because certainly the petition would not be granted; but we are sure readers of average intelligence will have no difficulty in detecting the fallacy involved in alleging two such contradictory reasons; and we are sure also that the religious sense of most people will condemn each argument taken separately, as satisfying neither their reason

nor their feelings. The second argument is introduced with a spurious piece of charity, which we must not omit to notice. Mr. Kingsley has demonstrated to himself that it would be presumptuous in him to pray for fine weather—but other people may do as they please. 'I do not blame any one for so 'doing,—God forbid. Who am I, to judge another? To his 'own master each man stands or falls; yea, and he shall stand, 'for if he be a righteous and pious man, God is able to make him 'stand. All I say is that looking at the matter as I do, it would 'be presumptuous in me.' Now a charitable judgment of other people's opinions is no doubt highly commendable, but it does not appear in this instance to have led to charitable conduct. On the contrary, the Rector of Eversley, by refusing to read the prayer for fair weather, has deprived his parish of whatever benefit direct or indirect might have resulted from the united offering of it up to God in Church. We are here, of course, taking for granted that its use would have done some good, and unless Mr. Kingsley were fully persuaded not of its uselessness, but of its positive harmfulness—his protestations of charity for the opinions of other people, we cannot but think, would have come with a better grace, if he had used the prayer and afterwards explained to the people that whatever their judgment might be, his own individual opinion was opposed to its use. The case would have been altogether different if he had been fully persuaded that it was wrong to use this prayer. But this is not the view maintained in the first half of the sermon, though it is the argument of the latter half; which we now proceed to notice.

The argument is as follows: 'Either we expect that our 'prayers will alter the weather or we do not.' 'If we do not 'expect it, we are most presumptuous in praying this prayer, 'for we are simply mocking God: and if we do expect it,' we are presumptuous for setting up our judgment against God's, who knows better than we do 'about the weather.' Now dilemmas make a marvellous show of argument, but there is scarcely a dilemma upon record from the time of the Greek Sophists to the present day which does not involve a fallacy. It sounded very conclusive to argue that motion was impossible because a thing must move either where it is or where it is not, and either supposition was thought to involve an equal absurdity. And probably if common sense had not come to the rescue to show that the conclusion was manifestly untrue, many people would have failed to see the fallacy of the argument. To expose the absurdity of the dilemma proposed in the proposition 'Either we expect our prayers will alter the weather or no,' it will be sufficient to observe that persons in preferring

such prayers are not bound to have any such definite expectation on the matter. We suppose such a sophistical question would fall to the ground at once, if the answer of a sensible person who believed in the efficacy of prayer were given, as it would naturally be, as follows: 'I do not know precisely the 'effect our prayers may have upon the weather, but I know 'that God encourages us to pray to Him for aid under all cir-'cumstances of difficulty or distress, and I doubt not that if the 'Church earnestly prays for this or anything else, she will either 'obtain what she petitions for or else something better.'

However, as we said before, a dichotomy always looks logical, and almost always is in point of fact used illogically. We will therefore dismiss the one half of the alternative which Mr. Kingsley does not suppose people will adopt, and will take the remaining passages of his sermon, which are meant to expose the absurdity involved in thinking that our prayers will alter the weather. And here there are two arguments as far as we can make out Mr. Kingsley's somewhat rhetorical declamations. First—God cannot alter the weather. Secondly—God will not. Mr. Kingsley evidently knows a great deal more about the weather than any other living philosopher. He tells us that 'the weather depends upon no arbitrary change in the will of 'God, but on laws as fixed and certain are those by which the 'seed becomes a plant, or by which a stone falls to the ground.' He indeed admits that we know little as yet about the laws of the weather, but this we know more and more certainly that it has laws, that even in this variable climate of England the rules of weather are really as fixed and perpetual as they are in those countries where the wet season and the dry, the hot season and the cold, follow each other year after year, with unvarying regularity. In other words Mr. Kingsley's opinion—an opinion however from which it must be remembered he is quite willing to allow other people to differ—is that the uselessness of prayer as regards all things connected with the physical world, is proved from the fact, which nobody but Mr. Kingsley as yet knows, that physical phenomena are absolutely unalterable. We should be curious to see how far Mr. Kingsley's consistency would carry him in a storm at sea when the vessel in which he was embarked was in imminent danger. Consistency is not one of his characteristics. Let us charitably hope that such a situation would find him acting contrary to his philosophy, and that the force of religious habit would demonstrate to him the falsity of the conclusion at which he seems in his sermon to have arrived.

But our author is not satisfied with logical and philosophical ground. He tries to press Scripture also into his service.

'Here as elsewhere,' he continues, 'every shower and every sun-'beam is foreordained from the foundation of the world. God 'has given them a law which cannot be broken, and they con-'tinue this day according to His ordinance serving Him and 'fulfilling His word.' Now it is really somewhat surprising that Scripture should be alleged in evidence for the unalterable nature of the laws of the physical world. We must not press the argument from the Old Testament, which certainly seems on many occasions to connect man's good and bad conduct with interferences on God's part, with phenomena as purely physical as can be imagined. We forbear, however, to quote the Old Testament. The school of writers, to whom Mr. Kingsley belongs, have given that up. To say that what he alleges contradicts the Old Testament may, for all we know, have no weight at all with him; but we must protest against a text from the Old Testament being altered, and then quoted to suit his purpose. It is impossible to understand him in any other sense than that God has imposed laws upon His creation with which He cannot interfere. And to bear out this strange theory, we have the magnificent passage of the 148th Psalm, asserting the sovereign dominion of God over the creatures of His hand, accommodated to the view that God's laws for the physical universe have been laid down once for all, and are unchangeable by anything that man can do. The well-known words of the Psalm, 'He hath given them a law which *shall* not be broken,' which certainly no Jewish writer could have intended to mean that God did not, much less that He could not, interfere with the laws which regulate the physical world, has been altered by Mr. Kingsley into 'God has given them a law which *cannot* be broken,' apparently wishing to imply that physical law has something which is in its own nature unalterable. Philosophy as we have seen is not Mr. Kingsley's forte. Perhaps he has heard of the laws of abstract morality being unalterable, and has hastily inferred that law in general is of the same character. The eternal distinctions of right and wrong are of course unchangeable. God cannot change His own nature, but the laws of the physical universe, such as we know them, are established by mere induction, and may yet have to be enlarged or modified to include cases which have not yet fallen under human observation. And so much may suffice for Mr. Kingsley's answer to the question 'Shall I set up my 'wisdom, or rather my ignorance, against God's wisdom? Shall 'I set up my narrow notions of what is good for England 'against God's boundless knowledge of what is good for Eng-'land and for the whole world at the same time. Shall I 'presume, because I think it is raining too long here, to ask

'God to alter the tides of the ocean, the form of the continents, 'the pace at which the earth spins round, the power and light 'and speed of sun and moon?'

But the prayer to God for fair weather not only sets up the wisdom of man against God's wisdom; it is also an insult to God on the score of setting up man's benevolence against God's. And here we quit the territory of philosophy, and enter upon the domain of theology. And here we have an accumulation of statements clothed almost in the very words of Scripture, adduced with the view of disproving the necessity of prayer for such blessings. We forbear to quote the passages. Suffice it to say that they are such as are usually alleged both in Scripture itself, and in sermons and exhortations, as arguments for addressing ourselves to God in prayer. Mr. Kingsley views them as inducing us to believe that He will freely give us all things without our asking for them. With him to seek first the kingdom of God and His righteousness seems to be equivalent to living according to the laws which He has laid down for our bodies and for our souls, without troubling ourselves as to communion with our great and good Creator, and the fact that He knows beforehand what we have need of, is used, not in the relation in which it stands in Holy Scripture, in defence of sincere prayer without hypocritical repetitions and display, but in deprecation of any appeal to God as regards this particular subject. We should have thought the very form of expression which Mr. Kingsley has been honest enough and silly enough to quote, would have been a sufficient rebuke. What could more distinctly imply the duty of asking than the words, 'Use 'not vain *repetitions*: for your Father knoweth what things ye 'have need of *before ye ask Him?*'

For indeed it must be observed that all the allegations against this particular prayer, on the ground here adduced, are good against all prayer. Mr. Kingsley, of course, is far from wishing to have them pushed to this consequence. And, indeed, a very plausible, not to say conclusive argument against prayer might be constructed on the score of God's knowing what is best for us better than we know ourselves, if there were no natural yearning in the human heart, to lay its griefs open to that unseen power which it feels controls and disposes all things; or, if under revelation there had been no precept given to man to pray for blessings which are beyond his own power to obtain. That certain phenomena do not fall within the province of prayer is undoubtedly true. It may be difficult, perhaps, in theory to draw the line between what are, and what are not legitimate subjects of prayer; and, undoubtedy, when Mr. Kingsley is able to prophesy with certainty what sort of weather we are

going to have, we shall be prepared to admit that the prayers for rain and for fine weather are superfluous and impertinent. Meanwhile we shall be content to believe, with the Church of England, that there are occasions when God's favour may be propitiated, or His anger deprecated by the united prayers of His people; we shall still believe that God sometimes punishes sin by the infliction of physical chastisement, and shows His acceptance of repentance by removing it. We are not ashamed to own that the instances of interference with natural law, so frequent under the old dispensation, are evidence enough to us that God has the power to alter the laws which He himself has made. Neither shall we be disposed to believe that as regards rain and fair weather, there is any material difference in the mode of God's dealing with His people under the Gospel dispensation in face of the declaration of the New Testament, that, 'Elias was a man subject to like passions as we are, and he 'prayed earnestly that it might not rain, and it rained not on the 'earth by the space of three years and six months. And he 'prayed again, and the heaven gave rain, and the earth brought 'forth her fruit.'

Lastly, we have another charge against Mr. Kingsley, that for the sake of heightening his argument he has quite misrepresented the whole tone of the prayer for fine weather. Who would have guessed that to use this prayer implied ingratitude? Yet this is the accusation with which the sermon concludes. We will give the passage at length.

'Let us, then, my friends, have faith in God, and not break out, before we know the facts and the truth, into hasty and ungrateful complaints that He is plaguing us and punishing us, when all the while He is most probably preserving and blessing us as He is wont to do. Let us not cry to Him greedily and blindly for fancied blessings, which may be real curses, and for the seeming bread which might prove to be nothing but a stone. We should not give such gifts to our children; neither will God to us. But for this let us cry; for the good gifts which can do us nought but good, which He has promised freely to those who ask Him for His Holy Spirit, for the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and the fear of the Lord, the spirit which is good for all men, in all ages, and in all places for ever; the spirit which will help us to be sober in good times, cheerful in bad times, and brave, prudent, and industrious in all times, as men who know that they have a Father in heaven, who has made the earth right well, and has given to man, if he will but use his reason, the dominion over it.'—P. 13.

Such being the tenor of Mr. Kingsley's theological teaching, the inhabitants of the parish of Eversley will have the less to regret their Rector's promise, as expressed in the opening of his inaugural lecture, 'the whole of such small powers as I possess 'will be devoted to this Professorate. It will be henceforth the 'main object of my life to teach modern history, after the method 'which shall give satisfaction to the rulers of this university.'

From the sermon let us turn to the lecture, the title of which, as given in the publication before us, is 'The Limits of Exact Science as applied to History.' And though we shall have much fault to find, we are glad to be able to say that we agree with Mr. Kingsley's views of history, much better than we can with his theological opinions. Many will ask, What has history to do with exact science? It will be said that exact science is purely deductive, and that as any science of history must rest almost entirely upon facts, as suggestive or illustrative of certain laws which seem to hold them together; exact science has, strictly speaking, no direct relation to history. But we need not dispute about terms. It is plain that Mr. Kingsley uses the word in a large and comprehensive sense, to include, for instance, such sciences as those of Statistics and Political Economy, and as opposed to such a science as Moral Philosophy, which has to take cognizance of the freedom of the human will. And the principal aim of the lecture is to exhibit an antagonism to that line of thought of which Mr. Buckle is the principal modern exponent. Little as we can approve the choice of Mr. Kingsley as Regius Professor of Modern History, he commands more of our sympathy than the school which deals with men as if they were machines, who refuse to recognise the anomalies which the arbitrary wills of individuals have created in the supposed regularity of succession of events, and who, if they were only commonly consistent, would openly avow the theory of fatalism. Against all such inhuman, unsympathetic, irreligious views of life we are glad to see protest entered by the new professor. We welcome the healthy and true view that history has not been altogether what it ought to have been, according to some theory of the writer's. We rejoice to find that there will be no ignoring of the distinctions of right and wrong in the conduct of individuals; or any attributing of moral good or evil to the necessary influence of climate, education, and the like. We cannot, indeed, go far with Mr. Kingsley, but thus far we can entirely sympathise with him, in regarding both the extraordinary characters of history and those who play an inferior part as our fellow creatures, and as men of like passions with ourselves, for whose faults we must be prepared to make allowance, whilst we admire the great qualities that have influenced nations and decided the turning points of history, or those perhaps equally great endowments of mind which God has seen fit should be comparatively unproductive of good. Whether Mr. Kingsley is not disposed to allow even too much weight to individual character and its influence upon the course of events, is a question which will be more easily answered after longer experience of his teaching. A knowledge

of human nature is no doubt a great assistance to the student of history, but we were quite startled at finding the knowledge of history and the knowledge of human nature almost identified, and still more at reading the first piece of advice with which the theory is followed up. 'If we would understand 'history, we must understand men; and if we would understand 'men, we must study biographies, and, if possible, autobio-'graphies.' Now, it is certainly true that an immense amount of information as to public affairs and matters which have affected the destiny of nations may be gathered from memoirs, diaries, autobiographies, and the like; but this is entirely independent of the individual character of the person described. We must altogether demur to the proposition that much of human nature is to be learned from biographies; whilst from an autobiography it is almost impossible to get at the idea which his contemporaries formed of any given individual. We should be greatly obliged for the information, if Mr. Kingsley will give it to us, what life there is—always excepting Boswell's Life of Johnson—which places the subject of the memoir before our eyes, with all his greatness and littleness combined. Still there is some truth in the exaggerated picture which Mr. Kingsley has drawn. And it is of great use in the study of history to have for each period human figures in whom we can take an interest, round which to group the dry details of facts and dates, battles and treaties. The only fear is that, like some recent writers of history, Mr. Froude for instance, and Macaulay, we should make too much of the individual and too little of the circumstances in which he was placed; lest, that is, the method of study which the Professor recommends, should degenerate into hero-worship. The proposed method has, moreover, this advantage, that by giving definiteness to his studies it enables the student the more easily to learn and retain in his memory the facts of history. It tells upon the reader in almost the same way as the bias or prejudice of the writer whose work he selects for his text-book. There cannot be a greater mistake than to place in any intelligent learner's hands a book altogether free from party spirit or political prejudice. Look, for instance, at the most interesting works on English history that have issued from the press; those by Hume, Lingard, Burnet, Collier, Froude, Macaulay. To such writers, whether right or wrong in their respective prejudices, the facts of history cease to be bare facts. They are made to serve the writer's purpose, and the reader is forced, whether he is inclined to agree with his author or not, to read more intelligently than he would have done if he had been reading a mere series of annals and chronicles of events. We are no admirers of Philosophies of

History, which are apt, as Mr. Kingsley remarks, to attempt the explanation of the facts which are met with by the very few laws which the writer has ascertained, and which also, for the most part, fall into another error which he justly condemns, viz. the explaining moral phenomena 'by physical or economic laws.' Mr. Froude's four volumes on Henry the Eighth afford perhaps the best illustration of what we mean. Probably there is not in the whole course of history a more ludicrously fallacious estimate of a character than the portrait drawn by Mr. Froude of Henry the Eighth; but the work is nevertheless most interesting and instructive, and it owes its interest in a great measure to the point and purpose which pervade it. We must not be supposed to be recommending that history be studied independently of the truth or falsehood of the views inculcated. All we contend for is that, if it is to be studied profitably, there must be *some* view, and that a prominent one, such as every reader possessed of ordinary intelligence will be able to discover for himself And it is but justice to Mr. Kingsley to say that we anticipate for him a considerable amount of popularity as a lecturer on modern history. He has views of his own, sometimes crude ones, as will have been seen by those who have read the preceding strictures upon his sermons. He is not afraid to speak them out, and he has a graceful manner of enunciating them; and as far as we are enabled to judge from the inaugural lecture, his views of history will be safe and healthy, though tinged we fear with an undue allowance for the faults of public men, on the score of their commonness.

The protest which he makes against 'the invincible, the continual, immutable, inevitable, irresistible,' ideas which figure in modern philosophical histories, meets with our hearty approbation. We could have wished that an inaugural lecture had taken somewhat more comprehensive ground, and had contained something more than a mere attack upon a very irrational theory, and a foolish recommendation of biography.

Not a word is said in this lecture on the relations of ancient and modern history. Not a word on the bearings of geography upon history. Scarcely a word as to the border ground occupied by the sciences of politics and economy. Except for the few lines devoted to the recommendation of biography, the author never loses sight of the one idea of the lecture; and the necessity of regarding the actors in the drama of history as men and women like ourselves, is illustrated by a variety of considerations which appear to us equally true and unnecessary. We do not, indeed, expect an inaugural lecture to contain allusion to all subjects that bear any considerable affinity to historical science, any more than we should expect it to contain

an abstract of universal history. Neither should we be disposed to find fault with it for confining its attention to a single subject, provided that subject were interesting enough to be worth dilating upon, or sufficiently controverted to require an elaborate defence. Such is not the case in the present instance. However imposing may be the appearance of the two schools of fatalists which have succeeded in arresting public attention, so manifest an ignoring of the first principle on which human society is constructed and legal enactments based, viz., the freedom of the human will, can never for long find much favour with the practical people of this country. On every ground, therefore, we consider Mr. Kingsley has assigned too much weight to this party. Neither is this all the fault we have to find. Not only does he attach an importance to these views, which is far beyond what they can lay claim to, but he has damaged his own cause by rushing injudiciously into the opposite extreme. If the average of human crimes, in connexion with certain localities and certain states of society, may not be pressed to the conclusion that certain sceptics have wished to push them—that human will is the creature of external circumstances; and if certain writers instead of taking this for their conclusion appear to start from it as their premise, and seem only bent on establishing a table of figures of statistics of past facts, which would greatly disappoint them if it should fail to correspond to the future—let us not undervalue the facts themselves. *Fas est et ab hoste doceri.* And though it is difficult to put the plainest accumulation of facts into a proposition which does not show some prejudice on the framer's part, let us take the facts in all instances for what they are worth. Truths of fact are not to be slighted, as we think Mr. Kingsley does slight them—because they have been extensively used to support a false theory—and the writer of history and all who are concerned in the education or the government of bodies of men of different classes, may extract valuable information from statistical tables. Such tables may have been formed on an erroneous hypothesis, or on an imperfect one, or upon no hypothesis at all; yet from them an educator who is working upon a principle may take what he may advantageously combine with other knowledge which he possesses, and with principles which the drawer up of the tables perhaps never heard of, or would dispute, if ever he should hear of them. For instance, it is not an unnatural supposition that a person fond of statistics should arrange certain classes of crime according to the colour of the people amongst whom they seemed to prevail—without reference to climate, education, civilization, the influence of Christianity, and the like. Such arrangement might be made

by one who was impressed with the belief that colour was a condition which considerably affected the character of the man, or on the other hand, by one who considered that it had little or no influence upon such results. Yet it is only necessary for the facts to be truly stated, to enable a ruler or educator to adapt his measures to the state of things in which he finds himself placed. Such person may be impressed with the belief that the want of Christian education may have been the main cause of the admitted result; yet if he is wise, he will not neglect indications which may point to other disturbing causes, which may have had a greater influence than he had himself supposed probable. We do not care therefore to see a fictitious distinction drawn between the statistical lessons and the moral lessons to be derived from the study of critical periods of history. Rather it should be said that the abnormal statistics of such periods should be studied in conjunction with those more apparently regular results produced by times and circumstances of greater tranquillity. And indeed, such periods of history are just the periods which are most attractive and interesting, and as they are sure in point of fact, to gain the greatest amount of attention on the reader's part, so in a philosophical point of view we have no hesitation in saying they ought to do. As to the difficulty of learning aright the lessons to be gathered from such periods of convulsion and anarchy, we are not at all at issue with Mr. Kingsley, yet nearly all that is worth knowing in history for any practical use that can be made of such knowledge, is derived from those striking epochs of anarchy and confusion which produce the greatest characters whether for good or evil, which teach us at once the force of circumstances, the contagious spread of opinions, the controlling force of genius, and a thousand other lessons which the dull routine of national life is unable to exhibit.

Mr. Kingsley is peculiarly unfortunate whenever he touches upon philosophical ground. In the view put out that the freedom of the human will is not fettered by laws; that its very freedom renders it impossible to pronounce upon the course of events which depend upon human will; that the future of history must be in the main as uncertain as what is now past was to the generation which preceded, we entirely concur; but Mr. Kingsley cannnot keep himself away from philosophical illustrations, and his illustrations are almost always expressed very clumsily, or else are in themselves untrue. Thus to illustrate the freedom of man's will, he chooses the case of a man falling into the water, who, he says, 'has his choice whether he 'will obey the laws of gravity and sink, or by other laws per-'form the to him artificial process of swimming, and get ashore.'

'True, both would happen by law, but he has his choice which 'law shall conquer, sink or swim. We have yet to learn why 'whole nations—why all mankind may not use the same provi- 'dential power as to which law they shall obey—which without 'breaking it, they shall conquer and repress as long as seems 'good to them.' We do not think it would have been possible to select a more unfortunate class of illustration. This is just one of those cases where the inability of the person to act otherwise than he actually does, has been pressed into the science of the Calvinist and Fatalist. And though the absurdity of the argument is palpable, in as much as to show that there is no freedom of will as to one given subject proves nothing with regard to others; yet the fact from which it starts is true, viz., that in such cases there is to the majority of men no freedom whatever. Not one man in a thousand who fell into the water, would have the alternative of saving or drowning himself; by mere blind instinct and necessity he would do his best to swim ashore. It is one of those extreme cases where freedom of action and freedom of will are entirely taken out of men's hands. We do not deny that here and there an individual may be so constituted as even in such a case as this to possess freedom of choice, but no such freedom falls to the lot of ordinary men.

With regard to what Mr. Kingsley next proceeds to, viz., the results of the freedom of the human will in the conquests achieved over nature; it is the mode of expression, not the truth expressed in it, to which we demur. 'Nature is strong, 'but I am stronger. I know her worth, but I know my own. 'I trust her and her laws, but my trusty servant she shall be, 'and not my tyrant; and if she interferes with my ideal, even 'with my personal comfort, then Nature and I will fight it out 'to the last gasp, and heaven defend the right.' Mr. Kingsley does not inform us to what class of men the individual who expresses himself thus magnanimously belongs, or whether this is the sentiment of the abstract and ideal man.

Again we have no objection to urge against the following remark which is upon the same subject. 'I am not sure but 'that the one fact that genius is occasionally present in the 'world is not enough to prevent our ever discovering any 'regular sequence in human progress, past or future;' but then instead of using this as an evidence of the inability under which we lie, of prophesying with any certainty what will be the future career of any given individual, and consequently of any given nation, Mr. Kingsley uses it to point the moral of the difficulty there exists in discovering 'the physiological laws which determine the earthly appearance of men.' Instead of

arguing our utter inability to gauge great or little, ordinary or extraordinary minds, the fact is made a peg on which to hang the two conclusions, both of them equally false, that to understand the 'science of great men,' requires a man greater than they are, and that 'the science of little men is no science at all.' And if the sequence of human history is so far removed from anything which we can call irresistible or inevitable, that it rather associates itself with the ideas of the crooked, the wayward, the mysterious, the incalculable, these epithets are due, not to the inexplicable nature of the laws by which the human will is governed, but to the fact that human will by virtue of its freedom is, so to say, independent of all law. Mr. Kingsley writes loosely and confusedly on these two subjects. It is quite true, that there are, as he expresses it, tremendous difficulties in attempting to analyze the phenomena of the moral world, and he is quite right in the protest he enters against those superficial writers who 'make the mistake of trying to explain 'the mysteries of the spiritual world, by a few roughly defined 'physical laws, and of ignoring as old-fashioned or even super-'stitious, those great moral laws of history which are sanctioned 'by the experience of ages.'

With regard to the rest of the lecture from this point to the conclusion, we are glad to be able to express our approbation of its general tone. It contains a sort of comment upon the text that 'righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people.' We believe that all history will bear its witness, though at times very obscurely, to the truth insisted on, though of course there was no room in an inaugural lecture for even the faintest attempt at proof of it, that 'as the fruit of right-'eousness is wealth and peace, strength and honour, the fruit 'of unrighteousness is poverty and anarchy, weakness and 'shame.' We will give the conclusion of the lecture in the author's own words, as it affords a favourable specimen of his writing, though not altogether exempt from faults similar to those which we have been commenting upon. We will only recommend Mr. Kingsley if he quotes Greek again, to get some scholar to correct the accents. There are only seven words of Greek in the whole lecture, and two of them are wrongly accented. Wrong accents prove not only want of scholarship, but inaccurate habits of mind; inasmuch as the person who cannot accent Greek for himself, might at least be expected to take the trouble to copy it right.

'In proportion as we look at history thus, searching for effective rather than final causes, and content to see God working everywhere without impertinently demanding of Him a reason for His deeds, we shall study in a frame of mind

equally removed from superstition on the one hand and necessitarianism on the other. We need not be afraid to confess natural agencies; but neither shall we be afraid to confess those supernatural causes which underlie all existence, save God's alone. We shall talk of more than of an overruling Providence. That such exists will seem to us a patent fact; but it will seem to us somewhat Manichæan to believe that the world is ill made, mankind a failure, and that all God has to do with them, is to set them right here and there when they go intolerably wrong. We shall believe not merely in an over-ruling Providence, but (if I may dare to coin a word) in an under-ruling one which has fixed for mankind eternal laws of life, healthy growth, both physical and spiritual; in an around-ruling Providence likewise, by which circumstances—that which stands around a man, are perpetually arranged, it may be, are fore-ordained, so that each law shall have at least an opportunity of taking effect on the right person in the right time and place; and in an in-ruling Providence too, from whose inspiration comes all true thought, all right feeling; from whom we must believe man, alone of all living things known to us, inherits that mysterious faculty of perceiving the law beneath the phenomena by virtue of which he is man. But we can hold all this surely, and equally hold all which natural science may teach us. Hold what natural science teaches? We shall not dare not to hold it. It will be sacred in our eyes. All light which science, political, economic, physiological or other, can throw upon the past, will be welcomed by us as coming from the Author of all light. To ignore it, even to receive it suspiciously and grudgingly, we shall feel to be a sin against Him. We shall dread 'no inroads of materialism' because we shall be standing upon that spiritual ground which underlies—ay, causes, the material. All discoveries of science, whether political or economic, whether laws of health or laws of climate, will be accepted trustfully and cheerfully. And when we meet with such startling speculations as these on the influence of climate, soil, scenery, or national character, which have lately excited so much controversy, we shall welcome them at first sight just because they give us hope of order when we had seen only disorder; law where we fancied chance; we shall verify them patiently, correct them if they need correction; and if proven, believe that they have worked, and shall work *οὐκ ἀνεὺ Θεοῦ*, as factors in the great method of Him who has appointed to all nations their times and the bounds of their habitation, if haply they might feel after Him and find Him, though He be not far from any one of them; for in Him we live and move and have our being, and are the offspring of God Himself.'

It will be seen from the brief sketch we have given of the sermon and the lecture, that the line adopted in the one is very different from the suggestions put out in the other. The sermon contains a protest against the vain attempt to interfere with the laws of nature, to change the unchangeable. The lecture deprecates the idea of the inevitable and the irresistible. There is, indeed, no absolute contradiction between the two views, for the subject matter to which they are respectively applied is different, yet the two occurring in such close juxtaposition as they do, serve to exhibit each the other, in bolder relief. It is an intelligible, though a false view, that the laws of nature are so uniform that they will never be altered; again, we can understand what a writer means who goes the length of saying that they cannot be altered. The theory of course is, that they are not within the province of human will. The

latter suggestion removes them also from the province of Divine will. And it is obviously no logical contradiction in one who holds such views to protest against their extension into a province where they do not hold. And Mr. Kingsley appears to consider that historical science deals with occurrences which are under the influence of human will, and are therefore incalculable. With regard to the efficacy of prayer, the most consistent explanation we can give of Mr. Kingsley's opinion is as follows. Future contingencies which ordinarily form the subject of people's prayers, may be divided roughly and for convenience' sake into two classes, spiritual and physical. The former are the legitimate subjects of prayer—being things which, for whatever reason, the Almighty has reserved for His immediate control, or being such as, by virtue of some laws but little if at all understood, prayer is by its own nature adapted to gain. With the latter it is of no use to attempt to deal, because they proceed upon laws which, whether in themselves alterable or not, we may be sure in point of fact will not be altered for any entreaty that we can make. With regard to the theology of this, we have to remark that no such distinction has any countenance in Scripture; which, on the contrary, abounds with instances in which the regularity of physical things is interfered with in answer to prayer. But beyond this we have to urge against it the unphilosophical nature of the distinction itself. We do not urge against Mr. Kingsley the illogical nature of the division; for the words are ours, not his, but we have made it in order to suit his theory and to represent it as fairly as we could. Neither have we any right to allege against him that in a sermon especially directed against the prayer for fair weather, he should have omitted the consideration, which was not part of his immediate subject matter, of the border territory that lies between the purely physical and the purely spiritual. Yet in taking account of his system, it is quite fair to point out its absurdity, by reference to its inapplicability to a class of subjects which he appears to ignore. And we really are quite at a loss to comprehend (not what his practice is, God forbid! but) what upon his theory it ought to be as regards the large territory which is, by the admission of all, on the confines of the physical and spiritual world. We will not press our own opinion that the ground is very far more extensive than Mr. Kingsley and his school are willing to admit. Let us reach it gradually. There is another occasional prayer upon which we know not how soon we may have to decide whether we will use it or no:—the prayer to be used 'in the time of any common plague or sickness.' Will any one say that the laws of pestilence are not known, at least as well as those of the changes of the

weather; Mr. Kingsley would himself be foremost to admit that however much or however little we may know of the laws by which certain forms of pestilence appear and disappear, are propagated or restrained, they do proceed in some regular order, obeying laws which God has established. We do not at all believe that he would have the hardihood to brave the consequences of the omission of this prayer. We are certain that if he had been in the midst of that terrible scourge which more than decimated the number of the inhabitants of our West Indian Colonies six years ago, his practice would not have formed the exception to the universal practice of the Colonial Church. Yet we are bold to say in common consistency it ought to have. The consequences of that scourge have been in many ways beneficial, both as regards temporal and spiritual things; and as far as this goes, it stands much on the same ground as the plague of rain and waters, which, according to Mr. Kingsley's probable view of the matter, has been the cause of the diminution of sickness which this year has witnessed. Yet it was not on that account the less really a scourge at the time of its infliction, nor less the proper object of deprecation on man's part towards God.

From the case of common plague or sickness, the step is a slight one to that of individual health. Now here is a case where, if anywhere, science is gaining the mastery over nature, and the knowledge of the laws that affect the changes of health and disease, seem to be closing up within narrow limits the range of prayer. Yet here is still felt, and will be felt till the end of time, to be its peculiar province—a province in which prayer is expected to have most power, and where such expectation is further rendered reasonable by experience. Here, again, is a case in which we will not do Mr. Kingsley the injustice to suppose that he would consistently adhere to his theory.

It may, indeed, be said that the subjects we have been considering are not wholly exempt from the influence of human will; and that that being arbitrary,—having, that is, the power to obey or disobey, there is room for prayer to God to guide it aright; as, for instance, in regard to such measures as are to be adopted for the prevention of the evil, or the effecting of the cure. We can scarcely imagine any one satisfied with such an evasion as this. Prayer is a mere hypocrisy commanded by God, if it is only to prevail in the natural mode of cause and effect.

Lastly, we come to the purely spiritual world, where it is not denied by any of those with whom we argue, that prayer has its legitimate scope, and will obtain what it asks for. But here we are met with an insuperable difficulty, unless the

spiritual world is utterly and entirely independent of, and has no connexion with, or influence upon, physical things. If there be any such connexion or influence, then we say, that a petition to God to interfere with spiritual things will have its influence upon material things. To take a simple example of this. According to the presence or absence in the heart of the habit of prayer for God's direction, will no doubt be the career of the man whose existence can change for good or for evil the fortunes of his fellowmen, who may extensively influence, and even permanently affect the physical condition of a country. It will not be denied, that on causes more or less directly connected with the spiritual world may depend the great works of art, the improvements effected in the soil and in the climate of a country, the leaving uncultivated, or the actual devastation of, large tracts of land. It is not only therefore conceivable that spiritual influences may have an effect on the physical condition of a country: it is an obvious truth that they have such effect. That is to say, if it be admitted that prayer addressed to God has power to change the heart of man, it follows, that if the actions of man have any influence, either permanent or temporary, on physical things, prayer to God for spiritual blessings will, at least in some cases, issue in changes in the physical aspect of things. Two adjacent islands, Barbados and S. Vincent, for instance, are in a very different condition as regards the amount and regularity of the rainfall—in the one island it raining nearly every day, the other being frequently for months without rain. The constant encouragement of vegetation in the one island, and the continual check placed upon it in the other, would materially tend to alter this state of things; and the doing this mainly depends on human agency, which agency is influenced, or at least may, in any individual case, be influenced by prayer to God. Let it not be objected that this is an instance where prayer acts by means of human instrumentality, and that the result produced neither interferes with any law of nature, and is itself an exemplification of the regularity of law. We quote it only as evidence that prayer may cause that to be in the physical world, which, without it, would not have been. And now what becomes of Mr. Kingsley's magnificent tirade. 'Shall 'I presume to ask God to alter the tides of the ocean, the form 'of the continent, the pace at which the earth spins round, the 'force, and light, and speed of sun and moon? For all this and 'no less I shall ask, if I ask him to alter the skies even for a 'single day.'

The subject we have been discussing is of so great importance, that we shall take leave to offer a few remarks upon it in conclusion, without further reference to Mr. Kingsley's opinions.

Let it be considered, then, in the first place, that God has it in His power to interfere with the laws of the physical universe, that is to say, He can at any time by virtue of His own will suspend the operation of laws which He Himself has made. The eternal distinctions of right and wrong are not within God's power, because to alter them is simply no object of power—it would be to contradict His own nature. Beyond this there are other things which are unalterable, as the truths of numbers, and many other truths which are necessary and eternal, *e.g.* that the centripetal force varying inversely as the square of the distance, the orbit must be a conic section. Such a law as this last, it must be remembered, is an abstract and ideal law, absolutely incapable of being exhibited exactly in fact. The kind of orbit is a necessary consequence of the supposition of the law of force. But that God *can* interfere with, and prevent the natural result of a combination of this and other laws, follows from the admission, that He made matter and imposed its laws upon it. It is a further consideration whether God *will* interfere; those who deny that He will, if there were nothing to be alleged on the opposite part, it must be allowed, have a fair case. The observed uniformity of law in the physical world certainly makes it unlikely that there will be interference in cases where we have been able to discover the law, and point to its at least nearly uniform operation for ages. It can establish also a fair argument from analogy in cases with which we are not so familiar. It seems reasonable to suppose that they also will one day be reduced under the head of known laws. On the other side Christians have to urge that there is the instinctive feeling of a Personal Being who may be propitiated: they have further to urge the instances of miracles which, in fact, have been done in contravention of the best established laws of the natural world, *e.g.* the resurrection of certain persons who were dead, and their restoration to life. They have further still to urge the promise made to prayer, and the truth well established by induction, that it has prevailed with God to alter the course of things, in cases to which the word miracle would not ordinarily be applied. Now as we have already implied in this paper, the case of miracles ought to cause some uneasiness in those who refuse to admit the power of prayer in physical matters—but the particular point we wish to press now, is the ordinary power of prayer in the case of everyday subjects, in cases, that is, where it is not known or supposed that an established law of nature is interfered with; and what we say is this, that—whatever weight may justly be attached to the argument from analogy, viz. that because in certain departments of physical science there is a known and usually unaltered law by which phenomena are

governed, it must be so also in regard to other cases which have no other similarity with the former, than that they are or seem physical;—any allegation as to the efficacy of prayer has a full right to a patient investigation in those subjects to which it claims to apply; neither is the ridicule which points to scientific laws with which it does not pretend to interfere, entitled to any consideration. Whatever be the certainty of the discoveries of science, there must be room for the natural feeling of immediate dependence upon God to expatiate. For after all, what else, in a religious point of view, is the uniformity of the motion of heavenly bodies, &c. but an indication, on God's part, of what His will is in regard to them—a will with which, when we know it certainly, it would be both foolish and wicked to attempt to interfere? And the very fact that God has afforded us such little light as to general laws, in things which are close around us and affect our daily life, may be taken on the other hand as the strongest evidence of His intention that His creatures should feel their dependence upon Himself personally, and should apply to Him by prayer for aid in cases where He has not so manifested His will, and where, by the very fact that He has not done so, He, as it were, invites their prayers.

ART. III.—1. *Papers read at the Educational Conference, in* 1857.

2. *An account of the Industrial School, Pershore*—1860.

3. *Hints for the Improvement of Village Schools, and the introduction of Industrial Work.* By the REV. JOHN FITZWYGRAM, M.A. Incumbent of Shipbourne, Kent.

4. *Industrial Employments in Girls' Schools.* By REV. JOHN ARMITSTEAD, Vicar of Sanbach, Cheshire.

IT has been for a long time a subject of complaint, that the progress of education in National Schools has received a check, by coming into collision with the requirements of labour. The school has to face competition with the market. The laudable desire of managers to lengthen the period of a child's tuition, is opposed by the natural want of parents to shorten it, for the purpose of gaining the earliest profit from his employment. This is a struggle of no light importance. It carries on the face of it a sort of test of the amount of influence which the efforts of the last ten or fifteen years have produced, in leading the popular mind to appreciate a higher standard of teaching for children. Nor has the struggle been watched idly, or without an endeavour to create a remedy. For some time past, school inspectors in their reports have discussed, and sought a solution of the problem. And how far the difficulty has been met by suggestions, and plans, and proposals,—the pamphlets at the head of this paper, selected out of numbers that are continually issuing from the press—will testify. Various inducements have been tried, but still the difficulty is only partially encountered. Prizes have been offered, as those, for example, instituted by Mr. Norris, in Staffordshire. Another plan is the half-time system, which is practised, we believe, in several schools, both in towns and in the country; and industrial training, more or less extensive.

Whatever may be the feelings with which the difficulty is viewed by separate inquirers, it has, at length, been perceived, that it is no mere vulgar conflict between mammon on one side, and higher aims on the other—that the poor man is not altogether to be blamed for his want of appreciation of prolonged school instruction. Calm and dispassionate inquiry into the state of National Schools, and into the peculiar wants of the labouring classes, has led candid minds to acknowledge, that as yet, the

supply and demand in school information has not been fairly adjusted. It is not the *amount*, but the *species*, of knowledge afforded which constitutes the defect. First, the simple necessaries of general information may be gained in a shorter time. Secondly, greater proficiency in the stock information provided in ordinary schools, however valuable or desirable in itself, is not of the character to compete successfully with the requirements of early labour. Boys may be taught to answer a few more questions, and fill up outline-maps with a few more names of towns and rivers, but as for education worth the name, or the trouble, there is none, so far as the wants of the labourer's child are concerned. And very often an older school will but resemble an overgrown infant school. It may seem harsh to say this in the face of all that has been done of late years to raise the tone and standard of education for the poor. It may seem a cruel answer to the hopes and efforts of zealous managers,—the clergy in particular, who, in most parishes, have borne the brunt of the struggle, and suffered far the greater burden of expense—but *it* is no less true. Whatever may be the advancement over past years, the kind of education is not yet generally established that meets the wants of those classes it is intended for.

At the Educational Conference held in 1857, the difficulty was well opened: and the result is definitely stated in the notice brought up by the Bishop of Oxford from section A.—'Whatever may be the difficulties surrounding the question, one 'difficulty the managers of schools have in their own power to 'consider, and that is, *adapting schools so as to make a further 'stay a real inducement.*'

This statement touches the real point at issue. Without attempting to furnish any positive remedy, it hits the blot exactly. National Schools must be made to contain *in themselves* the inducement. Whatever may be the force of extraneous inducements, as prizes, or even the half-time system taken in its ordinary sense, the real need of the age is not met until the system of education is itself adapted to furnish the remedy called for. It must offer to the labourer and artizan a real and appreciable return for the sacrifice of more years from the profits of the labour market.

A great deal has been written and spoken, especially of late years, about the principles of education; but sufficient distinction has not been made between the classes for whom education is intended. It must be remembered, that the object of education in the working man is wholly different from that of the upper or middle classes. That *specific* training, which is justly repudiated when advocated in opposition to the recognised system of our public schools and universities, contains the true principle for

the training of the labourer. The calling of the working-man from his earliest years is specific; and so his mind is properly directed to the specific matter, whatever it may be, from which his life-long necessities are to draw support. The active life of the gentleman (to use a common term) does not begin till a later age. His wants or profession demand enlargement of mind and thought. Education is to fit him for acting and taking part in the world, over and above his own peculiar calling. He is to be made a man capable of mixing with and understanding men of various professions besides his own. He wants therefore general principles, varied information, and a capacity of analyzing and judging matters of universal interest. A specific education would be injurious, if allowed to supersede the healthy and unbiassed régime, which is so precious a characteristic of English school-life. As it was well put in answer to former advocates of a purely professional training:—'The professional character is not the only 'one which a person engaged in a profession has to support. He 'is not always upon duty. There are services he owes which are 'neither parochial, nor forensic, nor military, nor to be described 'by any such epithet of civil regulation, and yet are in no wise 'inferior to those that bear these authoritative titles; inferior, 'neither in their intrinsic value, nor their moral import, nor their 'impression upon society.' But with regard to the labouring classes, the necessity for early specific training seems to be as stringent, as it is prejudicial in the education of the higher. The life of the working-man begins professionally at the earliest possible age. The calls of his lot are too peremptory to be evaded or delayed. And the problem for the friends of education is to devise a plan by which he shall receive the training most practically useful, as well as morally beneficial.

Mr. Norris, in his report for 1858, enters the same protest against continuance in the present *status* of school instruction.

'Now we must look these facts in the face. If our instruction has been to some extent of a mistaken kind, the sooner we confess the fault and try to amend it the better.'

'If the purpose of education be *to make the most of a child;* if, in order to make the most of a child, we must teach him to double the talent that God has given; if that talent be not the same for all, but for some *muscular strength*, for others *skill*, for others *intellect*—then it would seem to be a most unwise thing to aim chiefly at intellectual culture for all children. A wiser course would be to let our education be of three kinds, adapted severally to the three groups of children with which we have to do, For those whose lot will be unskilled labour in after-life, *physical training* in the way of industrial work would seem to be of paramount importance; for those who are to be skilled workmen or artizans, cultivation of *skill* ought to receive prominent attention; while for those who will have to work chiefly with the brain *intellectual* culture rightly occupies the first place. After the tenth or eleventh year the child begins to form habits and acquire notions which are likely to cling to him in

after-life; and I would ask whether we are doing wisely in accustoming those who will have to get their living by manual labour to go on, up to the thirteenth or fourteenth year, with the notion that their main business is *intellectual culture*. Hitherto, intellectual culture has monopolised our chief attention in nearly all schools; I want to see this monopoly destroyed. The really important thing in education is the formation of a virtuous and religious character; and this may be carried on in an industrial school just as well as in a school of purely intellectual instruction.'

Another inspector of great experience, Mr. Cooke, observes in reference to the same point, but speaking more exclusively of girls' schools:—'I feel a strong conviction that it is expedient, 'and indeed most necessary, to give a more decidedly practical 'tone to the education of all girls, and I have always strenuously 'advocated the introduction of all kinds of domestic employment 'which managers have found compatible with the ordinary work 'of schools.'

But does the teaching at ordinary National Schools answer this demand? Reading, writing, and arithmetic, with religious instruction, are, of course the proper and requisite foundations. But is the additional information supplied, *however long a child may stay*, anything more than the same subject-matter repeated and enlarged, with the addition of geography and some portions of English history? In fact, are not the sole additions made to the requisite foundations above mentioned, just the subjects which fail to recommend themselves as of superior importance, in comparison with the profits of early labour? and if this be the case, is the poor man's want of appreciation unnatural? To quote from one of the pamphlets at the head of this paper:—

'We must remember that the labourer has to exercise great self-denial to keep his children at school beyond *ten* years old; he knows and feels each Saturday night, that what his children would have earned, would be a most acceptable addition to his weekly wages. By sending his children to work, he gains an immediate tangible advantage, which he can perfectly understand; whereas it is no easy matter to convince him that his children are any the better for being able to tell the height of the Himalaya mountains, or to repeat, with the utmost volubility, the names and products of every dependency of the British Empire.'

Another and very important objection to the present system, is, that the whole of the present provision of instruction may be absorbed by those who attend school regularly, at an early age, so that the remaining years of their stay, should it be prolonged, will add but little to their knowledge. The curriculum of every school is fixed to a certain degree, and is generally of the same kind. Boys, who have been for two full years in the first class, will most probably have gone through all that the school professes to furnish; and so, a longer continuance in the same routine is practically to them a loss of time from more productive occupations. They are not advancing in life, nor

really receiving the *quid pro quo* for their money. This is not a place to enter minutely into school details: but it is plain that at ten or eleven years old, most children, unless extraordinarily stupid or irregular, will have gained enough of what schools now profess to teach. A longer stay would be an advantage morally, and even socially, and this no one denies; but in order to make that advantage appreciable to the working man, some solid benefit must be added. Thus a general change is called for in the head-classes at schools; without diminishing the present amount of information, fresh advantages should be offered. As the child approaches the term of his pupilage, so ought his education to be brought to bear upon the calling or occupation he is about to enter; and by this means a fresh impetus will be given to his studies. His reading, writing, and cyphering, so far from being lost or forgotten, will be exercised with redoubled zest as means towards a given and visible end. In short, the position arrived at is simply this:—all inducements to prolonged stay at school are more or less inadequate, which do not contain a specific adaptation of the education given. What the poor man's child requires is not intellectual culture only, but, as Mr. Norris observes, 'physical training,' the cultivation of *skill*. And so, for general purposes, the prize system, though laudable and even successful in particular instances, is not likely to be of lasting or universal benefit.

But industrial plans, on any extensive scale, have, it is said, so many obstacles to encounter, that the experiment is deemed a hazard. First, there is the great expense in outlay: then follows the difficulty of getting a sufficient market for their produce—as for example, the garden-stuff: or, if there be a kitchen and wash-house, few places can be found where there is demand enough to make the establishment self-supporting; and even then, may not the school suffer from unpopularity, if its work should interfere with the earnings of regular tradesmen and workers of any other description. Undoubtedly, there are practical obstacles more or less likely to be felt in different localities; and it will be yet very long before the system can become universally adopted. But so many successful instances may be quoted, already at work in various parts of the kingdom, that the experiment may be said to have been proved to be *worth* trying. It is clear that the chief difficulties will be found in country schools rather than in towns; and that industrial plans are easier of application to girl-schools than to boys'. Already, one of the most important points attended to in an efficient girl-school is *industrial*. Skill in needlework, practice in making of clothes—cutting out and sewing, may be called one of the chief tests of good female education; let us add washing and

cooking, and then the three practical requisites of a working-woman are attained. The girl is being fitted, while she stays at school, for what will be the staple employments of her life—as a servant, a wife, or a mother.

The expense in the first outlay is the main hindrance. As Mr. Cooke remarks in his report—'that such an adjunct is not 'universal, I believe to be simply owing to the practical difficul-'ties, and to the expense of keeping a kitchen. Managers inva-'riably approve suggestions for this and every branch of domestic 'training; but almost as invariably decline to undertake the 'responsibility of the first outlay and annual expenditure. It 'is not a sufficient answer to show how admirably the system has 'worked at Finchley, Highgate, and elsewhere. The success of 'a simple and inexpensive system, in a few instances, will have 'much effect in promoting this object.'

Here then, the example of 'the experiment made in the Parish of Shipbourne, Kent,' as described in a pamphlet by the incumbent, the Rev. John Fitzwygram, will probably be interesting, as showing success in a small parish, and with no peculiar advantages to start from. Mr. Fitzwygram appears to have begun by taking the right view of the object of a parish school, and that is more than half the secret of his success. In his own words:—'my first care was to consider what class and character 'of school would be best suited to the want of the parish, and 'could be supported by subscriptions which amounted to about '40*l.* a year.' The school is a mixed one, under a first-rate mistress; and by affording 'a sound practical education,' its character seems, in a few years, to have risen both in the reports of the inspectors, and in the estimation of the parish and neighbourhood. We quote from the Report of the Diocesan Inspector for 1859, as the best description of what is done at this school:—

'A certificated mistress, aided by a large staff of subordinates, carries on very efficiently the instruction of the children, and the daily supervision of the clergyman gives a finish to the moral tone as well as to the acquirements, which is rarely to be met with. In consequence, the school is resorted to by classes above the labourer, constituting almost the entire first class: and as they pay according to their means they lighten the otherwise heavy expense of the establishment. The penmanship alone seemed to me open to criticism.

'The Industrial department for girls consists of a kitchen and wash-house in which a separate mistress teaches, daily, five or six girls at a time, cookery, baking, washing, and household work; about twenty girls being thus employed eight hours each per week. The good things operated on in the kitchen find a ready sale in the parish; so that this branch is nearly self-supporting.

'A small cost is incurred in teaching the elder boys gardening on two days in the week, in a piece of ground adjoining the school, which has lately received a valuable addition by the enclosure of waste.'

The accounts of the industrial department, though showing a small deficit at the end of two years, are certainly satisfactory:

and Mr. Fitzwygram remarks, 'From these statements it 'appears, 1st. that out of a population of 440, 115 children are on 'the books of the school, or, in other words, that more than one-'fourth of the whole population are under instruction. 2dly. that 'high payments do not diminish the number of scholars. 3dly. 'that the loss on the industrial department, after a fair trial of 'more than two years, has not been such as need alarm any 'school managers who may be inclined to try the experiment in 'other parishes.' On the subject of the deficit, he adds, 'It is 'to be regretted that the Committee of Council, under the pre-'sent regulations, give so little aid towards maintaining a school 'of this sort. If instead of the present grant of five shillings a 'head for each girl under instruction, the Committee of Council 'would pay *one-third* of the salary of the industrial mistress, 'provided that at least twenty girls over ten years of age were 'under instruction, the cost to the public would be less than the 'cost of a single pupil-teacher: while the prospect of such 'assistance would lead to an immediate increase of the number 'of industrial schools, which could then be maintained without 'any great expense to the managers.'

Another very excellent example is found at Pershore in Worcestershire. The last report of the school, dated September, 1860, gives a succinct account of its origin and present condition.

'The industrial branch of the girl's school has now been established two years and six months, and success has hitherto attended it. The girls have entered into the work cheerfully and eagerly; their parents have expressed themselves favourably towards the scheme; the public have pronounced it a step in the right direction; and H. M. Inspector of schools has reported it to be entirely 'satisfactory.'

'Difficulties must attend the commencement of such an establishment, and certain expenses must be incurred at the outset, but with economy, an industrial school, once established, may be carried on at no very great cost. The early history of that at Pershore is as follows:—in a house adjoining the school play-ground a person happened to be living, who was well qualified to act as matron. The landlord very kindly altered and added to this building, so as to make it more convenient for its present use. The industrial apartment contains a brick oven, with a mangle, and an ironing-table, in addition to the usual furniture of a *cottage* kitchen: and here the girls, three at a time, work four afternoons and one morning in the week.'

At Sanbach in Cheshire, with a manufacturing population of 5376, a similar system has been carried on with success; though differing considerably in detail. The vicar of Sanbach has, in a pamphlet, which we have placed among others at the head of this paper, briefly pointed out—'to what extent industrial 'employments, cooking included, may be introduced with ad-'vantage into all schools, with the clear understanding that the 'requisite instruction be conveyed without any prejudicial

'interference with the time usually devoted to book-learning.' He proposes, 1. Dress-making; 2. Washing; 3. Household-work; 4. Cooking. Household work has generally been found a fallacy; for the sweeping out and cleaning of the school can hardly be dignified with such a title, or be regarded as bonâ fide industrial work. And so Mr. Armistead suggests the master's house, as in some degree supplying 'the deficiency, for in it the 'children can with advantage to him, and profit to themselves, 'learn much that is useful.'

Our extracts from others have been, perhaps, too numerous, but the subject is one which is best treated by examples. The existence of several successful plans already at work is the best guarantee that the principle of the system is sound, and compatible with ordinary resources. But details are so much dependent upon local circumstances, that it would be useless to be more minute. Every one, who determines upon trying the system, will find that he will have to adapt both the work and the routine to the exigencies of his parish or neighbourhood. This, however, may be safely given as the result of our inquiries, that the application of industrial plans is perfectly safe, if not indispensable to *girl*-schools. There is, as may easily be seen, much greater difficulty in providing both material, and a staff of teachers for boys than for girls, while the necessity is scarcely so pressing. Many opportunities are open to boys, beyond the pale of the national school, for acquiring the rudiments of practical knowledge. In towns, the Mechanics' Institute often furnishes, through adult classes, the means of learning various and *special* points of information. And even in country parishes, the evening school, where the attendance of girls may be thought objectionable, allows a favourable opportunity for affording young men instruction in the subjects which they may most want. On these grounds, while we argue for the introduction of more *specific* training into *all* schools; the ground is already cleared for a general application of the system to girls.

What is the object of education, taken as a real benefit as well as a popular movement? Is it not to improve the condition of the working classes, and to elevate as well as direct, the tastes of the population generally? And, what is the outcry—unmeaning and absurd as it may sound—against popular education—but that it makes the children of the labourer above their station and work? But such an outcry could have no ground to rest on, where the education given is carefully and judiciously adapted to the station and prospects of the pupils. It is desired to make children capable of 'doing their duty 'in that state of life into which God has been pleased to call

'them.' Not to let better instruction render them above their work, but to send them from school into practical life as intelligent workers. At present, in many minds, daily labour and intellectual improvement are regarded as separate conditions. And what is the reason? but that they have been separated actually in practice, as well as in idea. Let then the school be made a place to dispel the fallacy; and let children learn that where their minds are opened and stored, there, also their several callings in life, however humble, are dignified by a place in education. The unhappy Frenchman, who committed suicide because he could not submit to his destiny as a grocer, is not likely to find many imitators. But contentment in the lot of humble life: sense of duty in handling the spade, or following the plough; the feeling that every man is ennobled by a conscientious and intelligent pursuit of his specific calling—whether that of labourer or artizan—these sentiments alike honourable, as well as bracing to the possessor, and instinct with good to the population at large, will be best fostered by giving to education a practical tone, and by making the school a preparation for real life. Without doubt, the ignorance of parents and the too unpractical character of national education have combined to foster the notion, that if a child be a bit of a scholar, it is throwing him away to make him a labourer. And in like manner, the broad demarcation between intellectual pursuits at school and rough work in daily life has equally fostered in the child the notion, that in proportion as his head is cultivated, the labour of his hands is beneath him. But this is a cruel as well as debasing effect, and one utterly unworthy to be the result of the care and the expense which have been bestowed on education of late years. Let manual skill be made a part of a child's ambition to learn, and it will be the pride of after-life to excel in it. Let education be a witness that no trade is debasing, and no labour below a man which he honestly and diligently fulfils. Thus we shall see growing up an intelligent and thriving community; and one, perhaps, *crying*, evil of this progressive age may be assuaged, viz. the restless craving to get above one's allotted work,—by a training in which work is raised to its proper place; and to excel in that work be felt as much an honour, as victory to the soldier, or eloquence to the orator, or splendour to the poet.

ART. IV.—*The Theology of the Early Christian Church, exhibited in Quotations from the Writers of the First Three Centuries. With Reflections.* By JAMES BENNETT, D.D.

IT is well known that many years ago, we believe in 1833, a lecture in imitation of the Boyle or Bampton Lectures of the Church of England, was established by the managers of the Congregational Library. Several volumes of these Congregational Lectures have been published, and of these the work at the head of the present article forms the eighth series. The doctrines and opinions inculcated in these Lectures have recently been brought within the reach of every one by a new and uniform edition, cheap, and neatly got up, which speaks well for the zeal and tact of the dissenting body whose principles they are intended to vindicate. One object for which the Congregational Lecture was instituted is declared to be 'to trace the errors and corruptions which have existed in the 'Christian Church to their proper sources, and by the connexion 'of sound reasoning, with the honest interpretation of God's 'Holy Word, to point out the methods of refutation and 'counteraction.' We imagine that it cannot be either uninteresting or unprofitable to our readers to be made acquainted with what an advocate of the principles of Congregationalism, selected from the notable men of that sect, has to say on 'The 'Theology of the Early Christian Church.' Especially does it appear to us to be a matter of the deepest interest to Churchmen to be informed how a learned Dissenter of modern times will 'trace to their proper sources' what he deems to be 'the errors and corruptions of the Christian Church;' how he will refute or counteract those supposed 'errors,' either by 'sound reasoning,' or 'honest interpretation' of Holy Scripture.

A desire to see for ourselves the result of this inquiry, and to communicate it to our readers, has suggested the present article. And the impartial consideration of a work upon so important a subject as Early Christianity, may possibly be useful to others beyond our own communion, even to some of those Independent Dissenters from whom the Congregational Lectures emanate. In these days of rapid and perpetual intercourse among persons of all ranks and all opinions, the pages of the *Christian Remembrancer* may, perchance, be read, with profit, if not with pleasure, by certain members of some 'Congregational Churches.' At any rate all who call them-

selves Christians will be ready to agree that the subject chosen by Dr. Bennett is a most important one, and to the vast majority of Christians it will seem not less difficult than important, when it is taken up by a Congregationalist, and avowedly treated with a view of making the theology of the Early Christian Church harmonise with the modern system of the Independents. Any attempt to accomplish this difficult task ought to be met in a fair and candid spirit, and we are fully prepared to recognise the peculiarities of the Congregational system, either in the New Testament, or in the writings of the three first centuries after Christ, so soon as ever we can see them there. And reckoning upon a like unprejudiced and impartial spirit in the majority of our readers, we shall at once proceed to the consideration of Dr. Bennett's pleadings in favour of Primitive Congregationalism.

It is disappointing at the outset to find, that 'all veritable 'ecclesiastical history begins and ends with the Apostles' Acts;' and that the guides we have for the next age, are often 'little 'else than blind and lame.' Similar assertions are scattered up and down the whole of Dr. Bennett's book, and these, from the second page of it, are rather mild specimens of their intensity. This depreciation of the character of the witnesses before a word of their testimony has been heard, certainly looks like an instinctive feeling that their testimony will be adverse. And we must acknowledge that it would have been better policy, as well as better taste, in our author, if he had flattered the Fathers less, when they seem to speak for his theory, and scolded them less, when they do no such thing! Thus he says of Clemens Romanus, in one place, that he, 'as the Father 'of the Fathers, has been our oracle on the doctrine concerning 'the Church.' Elsewhere he speaks of 'the heathenism of 'Clement's mind' in using the illustration of the phœnix, and shortly afterwards exclaims: 'How was she' (the Church) 'weakened and degraded by Clement, the best of the Fathers, 'as well as by all those who followed him as an oracle!' (Comp. p. vi. and 214, 217.)

This is one of the first things that strikes the eye of a Churchman in the volume of which we are now speaking. The writers of the three first centuries are usually depreciated and set aside in the most unceremonious fashion, and yet the very book itself professes to be founded on their authority; its title page (reasonably enough) puts these writers forward as the means whereby the theology of the Early Christian Church is to be exhibited. A few specimens of the spirit with which these witnesses are assailed may serve to introduce to our readers the style and manner of the Congregational Lecturer.

Entirely ignoring Bishop Pearson's immortal work, Dr. Bennett tells his readers (p. 13) that 'the Epistles of Ignatius require us to 'sin against almost every canon of criticism before we can regard 'them as both genuine and uninterpolated.' And the way in which he speaks, immediately afterwards, of this aged martyr, is simply beneath notice. Irenæus he dismisses with the character of having 'said many strange things, and in a work so 'large, few good ones:' in short, to use the Doctor's own words, of 'sometimes raising more dust than he lays.' (P. 22.) Of Clemens Alexandrinus it is asserted that 'his mind was too full of heathenism to leave due space for Christianity;' and his morality is said to be 'like that of Socinian writers.' (P. 24.) Of Tertullian, the Congregationalist Teacher first rebukes the 'unchristian spirit,' and then in the same page proceeds to give that Father this character:—'Conceited, arro-'gant, and fierce, his very humility is proud, and his contention 'for the faith betrays that spirit which inspired the familiars of 'the inquisition.' And then it is stated that 'our first indignant impulse would lead us to fling into the flames' the 'disgusting impurity, which, with all his parade of sanctity, —falsely so called—defiles Tertullian's page.' (P. 32.) To S. Cyprian the Independent Doctor is rather more lenient, but even of him it is asserted that 'no important use can be made of one who is so little of a theologian;' one who 'is a favourite 'of the idolators of the Fathers, because he lived in a corrupt 'age.' (P. 34.) 'The loss of the history of Hegesippus, is,' Dr. Bennett complacently says, 'not the less to be regretted be-'cause the remaining fragments show his want of judgment; 'for children often put us in possession of facts which wiser 'heads would have concealed.' (P. 36.) Again, 'Origen,' he states, 'is far enough from teaching Celsus the doctrine of atonement with sufficient clearness and fidelity.' (P. 108.) Or, as he quaintly puts it against the Fathers generally, 'The 'material cross soon became an idol, which hid from their view 'the sacrifice for sin.' (P. 110.)

But it would be as tedious as it would be unavailing to attempt to point out all the passages in which our author rails at the whole class of writers out of whose works, worthless as he thinks them, he proposes to exhibit the theology of the Early Christian Church. Even documents like the Martyrdoms of S. Ignatius and S. Polycarp—pronounced, both of them, to be genuine by such critics as Ruinart, Grabe, and Wake, and one of them partly preserved by Eusebius himself—even these precious records of men found faithful unto death, are sneered at as being, according to Dr. Bennett, 'productions of a later age.' And he adds, 'like 'the letters of Abgarus and the Acts of Pilate, they show the

'propensity to forgeries which was indulged by well-meaning 'men called Primitive Fathers.' (P. 40.) One step further naturally leads from sneering at the Fathers, to sneer at the apostles themselves. Of this we grieve to have to quote the following specimen. Concerning the advantages of the Fathers in living near the time of the apostles, the Congregational Lecturer says, that in this respect Simon Magus surpassed them all. And then he tells us that what the apostles said and did, if ever so faithfully recorded, would not afford safe guidance to us. For instance, 'how truly might some one have said that he heard 'Peter swear that he knew not the man of Nazareth!' (P. 242.)

This profane language, sparing neither the apostles nor the Saviour Himself, when the authority of the companions and successors of the apostles was to be set at nought, may lead us to another unhappy peculiarity of Dr. Bennett's Lectures—we had almost said, of the generality of writings emanating from the same school of thought and opinion. This peculiarity is the reckless way in which, for the sake of proving certain opinions to be true, or at least plausible, principles are assumed and acted upon which, if fairly carried out, would end in open infidelity. A few instances of this may be selected out of the many that occur in the volume before us. Dr. Bennett says that the reception which, in the very early ages of Christianity, the Shepherd of Hermas obtained, 'gives such a view of the dis-'cernment of those times, as forbids us to wonder at any 'corruption that obtained, either in the doctrine or practice of 'the Church.' (P. 39.) What reply would Dr. Bennett have to the infidel's objection, that, supposing such to be 'the discernment of those times,' the canon of Scripture itself rests upon a very tottering foundation? But, unfortunately, writers of the Doctor's school do not always leave it to infidels to carry out their premises. Occasionally, in their zeal against 'human authority' and 'man's tradition,' they will venture to decry those very means by which it has pleased God in His infinite wisdom and mercy to hand down to us His written word. The following passage from the book before us would scarcely be worth quoting except in illustration of this fact. After a squeamish protest against the fatal consequences of binding up the Apocrypha with the canonical Scriptures, Dr. Bennett gives the following strange account of the conduct of the Church in settling the Sacred Canon :—

'That the Church was so remiss and so late in settling this question was one of its earliest and most serious faults. There was no sufficient reason for deferring it to the time of the Council of Laodicea, when they had no better opportunities for coming to a just decision than had been enjoyed for years, not to say ages, before. But if they were then not in a better position, they were

in a worse; for the witnesses to the origin of the sacred books had been long dead, and the apocryphal writings had gained a footing, or as Tertullian would say, had acquired prescription, and the minds of the faithful had been bewildered by the intermixture of the true and the false.'—P. 50.

Taking this statement for granted, how very few onward steps in a similar direction would lead him who scolds the Church, yet receives its settlement of the canon, into the seat of the scoffer, who denies that the Church ever did, or could really and satisfactorily, settle the canon of Holy Scripture at all.

Again, when the Congregational Lecturer, unable to deny that the great doctrines of the Gospel are taught by the Fathers, complains that 'the elements of a system are scattered with rude simplicity and perplexing vagueness over their works' (p. 103), it is well worth noting that these are among the objections of infidels against the Scriptures themselves. So, once more, just in the spirit in which infidels talk of individual conscience, and the improbability of our salvation depending upon our persuasions concerning the truth or falsehood of a certain book, Dr. Bennett glosses [1] upon a well-known passage in Tertullian thus: 'Every one lives by his own faith, and with 'God is no respect of persons; so far is He from suspending our 'salvation on a certain order of persons called priests.' (P. 177.) Indeed, in Dr. Bennett's eyes the practice of clinical baptism, lest persons should die unbaptised, 'marks the advance of superstition.' (P. 200.) In the infidels' eyes the practice of baptism at all—its administration being entrusted to certain persons, call them what you will, and salvation being made in some sort to depend upon it—are reasons enough to tempt them to reject Christ's own words. No wonder that a writer who thus plays fast and loose even with Holy Scripture, should sometimes fall into strange blunders respecting it. As, for example, when depreciating S. Cyprian, the Doctor asks, 'But 'what accuracy can we expect from one who makes the Holy 'Spirit a mediator, through whom we offer our prayers?' The passage of Cyprian is not indicated, but we presume that the Doctor is acquainted with Rom. viii. 26, 27, and we will undertake to say that S. Cyprian does not go beyond what is there revealed to us. Really, sometimes the spirit of what calls itself 'the religious world' sadly, but irresistibly, reminds us of those men in the parable, who were as far from reverencing the Son, as they were from sparing the messengers and servants, of the Lord of the vineyard.

[1] The passage is that in which Tertullian asserts, that a layman may administer the sacraments, in a case of necessity. The Doctor somewhat freely translates 'ubi necesse est' 'if occasion required.'

It may vary, if not relieve, the subject, to turn to two of Dr. Bennett's most notable and oft-repeated examples of the falsehood and puerility of the Fathers; examples which will repay a brief consideration of them by way of digression. The first example is the notion held by so many of the early Fathers, that 'the sons of God' mentioned in Genesis vi. 2, 4, were *angels*. This notion is not only called a 'vile dogma,' 'vile theology,' but a sort of catholic consent is claimed for it by Dr. Bennett, in order, we presume, to invalidate the authority of the Fathers in those matters wherein they do speak dogmatically, and with an universal consent. It is curious, indeed, to mark how invariably the opponents of that due and reasonable reverence which the Church of England has always cheerfully paid to Christian antiquity, are forced to misrepresent our doctrine on the subject before they venture to attempt to confute it. It is so certainly in this case. The Congregational Lecturer chooses to call the notion of angels being seduced by the beauty of women (Gen. vi. 2, 4), 'no private opinion of Justin, but the catholic doctrine of the day.' (P. 97.) If Justin 'led the dance,' to use the Lecturer's elegant language elsewhere, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Lactantius, followed his lead. And suppose them to be all mistaken in their view of the meaning of the difficult text in question, what then? Does it at all follow from the fact of these early Christian writers not having been infallible in all things—which we never said they were—that they are therefore incredible witnesses of certain facts? Why, we might as well disbelieve Dr. Bennett's testimony concerning the fact that there is an Anglican liturgy, and that there are bishops, priests, and deacons in our Church, because he dreams about there being but one congregation at Rome when there were fifty thousand Christians there, as reject the authority of the Fathers concerning contemporary facts, merely because they misinterpreted Genesis vi. 2, 4! In how different a spirit does S. Augustine speak of the mistakes of others upon this very point: 'Omittamus igitur 'earum scripturarum fabulas, quæ apocryphæ, eo quod earam 'occulta origo non claruit Patribus, à quibus usque ad nos 'auctoritas veracium Scripturarum certissimâ et notissimâ suc-'cessione pervenit.' (De Civ. Dei. lib. xv. cap. 23.) The later Fathers agree with Dr. Bennett in his mode of understanding the meaning of Genesis vi. 2, 4; for which reason he accounts them wiser than their teachers. But when these same later writers reiterate more plainly, more boldly, more continually than even their predecessors the same unswerving testimony concerning the threefold Christian ministry and the sacraments of the Church, then they are corrupted, degenerate, foolish.

As if, forsooth, the standard of the Church's wisdom in all ages could be taken for granted to be its conformity with the Non-conformist's notions in the nineteenth century.

The next of Dr. Bennett's examples of the falsehood and puerility of the Fathers need not detain us so long. It is the well-known instance of the phœnix, alleged by S. Clement of Rome, and others, in illustration of the doctrine of the resurrection. This unlucky illustration stands foremost among the 'strange fancies,' some that 'we may call Popish, and some ultra-Protestant,' which our Lecturer says the Fathers held concerning the future state. By the way, it would have been instructive to have been told what fancies the Congregationalists do reckon to be ultra-Protestant. However, without specifying whether the fable of the phœnix be a popish or ultra-Protestant fancy, the Doctor says it is 'disgraceful' to S. Clement. Then in the next page he seems to change his mind, and to think that, in so ignorant an age, the mistake was as 'natural' in him, as in Tacitus; and that the disgrace belongs rather to 'professed scholars, living in a better-informed period, regarding such writers as oracles.' Still, as Christians, the Congregationalists are represented by their spokesman 'deploring the 'heathenism of the mind that dictated this passage about the 'phœnix, and of those who boast their descent from such 'Fathers.' Nay, the Lecturer's eye is so quick at seeing into a mill-stone, as the saying is, that he asks—'Who can help 'seeing, and blushing to see, that Clement had a lurking 'reverence for the altar of the sun and its priests?' Poor S. Clement! had he been as good an Independent as Dr. Bennett elsewhere tries to make him out to have been, he would at all events have been deterred from this lurking reverence by the instinctive horror with which all altars and all priests are usually contemplated by that sect.

This illustration of the phœnix affords a capital opportunity of depreciating two or three of the early Fathers, and is dwelt on with evident satisfaction from page 213 to 217 of the 'Lectures on the Theology of the Early Christian Church.' Dr. Bennett sneers at the believers of a very early period, when he says, 'This epistle of Clement, spiced with heathenism, strong as the 'aromatic tomb of the phœnix, was read in the first churches 'after those of Paul or Peter, James or John!' He then talks of other Fathers 'fondling the miraculous bird of the sun,' and speaks of the 'fable' being 'propagated among Christians, and supposed to be proved from Holy Writ;' and then once more chuckles over the idea that 'we are now told to regard these Fathers as the authoritative interpreters of Scripture!' So was the Church 'weakened and degraded by

'Clement, the best of the Fathers, as well as by all those who 'followed him as an oracle,' until 'this precious morsel of 'patristic theology was at last dropped.'

Certainly it does look like the consciousness of a not very strong cause, when we find a writer indulging in tirades like these. The phœnix is a mere illustration, borrowed, as it happens, from fable, though cited as truth. But if the mere use of such an illustration is so shocking in S. Clement, what will Dr. Bennett and his friends say to the infidels who will remind them that even the Bible mentions leviathan and the unicorn? And surely, after all, we might imagine S. Clement betrayed into the use of a false illustration, and yet we need not in the slightest degree impeach the truth of his testimony concerning the doctrines held in his day. An example of this occurs to us with which we will conclude this digression. How many of Mr. Spurgeon's illustrations are quite as far-fetched, if not quite so aromatic, as that of S. Clement! Yet, at the same time, to how many truths of our holy religion, though it may be in a coarse, imperfect, and disagreeable way, does Mr. Spurgeon's preaching bear witness! So that it is quite possible, while we repudiate the coarseness, irreverence, or untruth, which often, even in these days of refinement, disgrace what are called popular illustrations of religious truth, to candidly acknowledge and gladly welcome whatever portion of truth may be at the same time testified. S. Clement's phœnix, though a fable, leaves his witness of the doctrine of the resurrection untouched. Dr. Bennett's jesting translation of the word *ἐπισκοποῦντες*, *bishopising*, does not at all shake the testimony, which runs through his whole book, that episcopacy, however easy it may be to deny it boldly, is very hard to be got rid of satisfactorily.

And this subject brings us at once to the most curious part of Dr. Bennett's Lectures. The chief end at which we aimed when first we turned to them, was to arrive at some degree of knowledge of the way in which a Congregational Lecturer could meet the facts which history records concerning the doctrine and discipline of the Early Christian Church. And supposing that those historical facts and those precious remains of Christian antiquity, which we have always deemed so conclusive in favour of the Church system, had been shown to be really in favour not of that, but of the Congregational system, gladly would we have followed wherever truth might have led us. But most assuredly, if Dr. Bennett's theory can satisfy Dissenters that they are right, this is the utmost it ever can do; it never will seem plausible enough to convince Churchmen that they are wrong. For instance, at p. 14, S. Ignatius of Antioch is introduced to the

reader of the Congregational Lectures in no very flattering terms, and his witness for 'the apostolic origin of prelacy' is compared to the vanity of 'a child parading a new toy of which he thinks he can never make enough.' Elsewhere it is asserted of S. Ignatius, that 'to establish an exclusive monarchy in each 'Church, and banish all idea of the lawfulness of more than one 'bishop, he asserted the most extravagant, not to say, impious 'things.' (P. 156.) Yet, strange to tell, this same Ignatius is quoted as 'exhibiting,' in the following passage, 'a Congregational 'Church.' 'Wherever the bishop appears, there let the multi-'tude be; as wherever Jesus Christ may be, there is the Catholic 'Church.' This parallel, if worth anything, Dr. Bennett tells us, *proves* that, as Christ's presence in the midst of the general assembly of all Christians constitutes 'a [*sic*] Church universal, 'so the [*sic*] Church particular is one assembly convened with 'the bishop in the midst.' (P. 137.) And here we have a primitive exhibition of 'a Congregational Church.' Taking courage from the boldness of this dogmatic assertion, the Lecturer then proceeds to develop a theory in favour of his darling Congregationalism, which, we should think, will speak for itself. He declares that even in the metropolitan cities the Christian Church did not enlarge itself beyond a single congregation for the first two centuries after Christ. In proof of this assertion as to Rome, he says, that 'Clement, before the end of 'the first century, wrote a letter in its name as one assembly. 'Justin Martyr, in the middle of the second century, describes 'it as one; Minucius Felix gives no hint of more than one, nor 'does Tertullian; and even Cyprian, in the middle of the third 'century, seems to know of no more than one assembly at 'Rome.' (P. 138.) 'This,' our Independent guide is quite aware, 'may excite surprise, and may to many seem incredible.' And knowing this fact, it does seem a pity that he did not explain to us by what process he contrives to do away with the 'ingens multitudo,' even in the time of Tacitus; how he escapes the calculations of Gibbon, that the Christians in Rome numbered 50,000 by the middle of the third century: a calculation which Professor Blunt declares to be very much below the truth.[1] But our Lecturer troubles not himself with these nice calculations and explanations. He disposes of all objections against his

[1] Even absurdity will not always secure originality. 'The learned and judicious Mr. Paul Baynes' (so Neale calls him), who died in 1617, has forestalled Dr. Bennett in his curious hypothesis. For 'rather than grant there were more than one congregation at Rome in Cornelius's time, he adventures to maintain that 20,000 people might make but "one congregation," which cannot but seem ridiculous to any one who considers the circumstances of the Church in those times.'—*Bp. Sage, Vind. of Principles of Cyp. Age*, § 44, ch. ii.

theory, which he owns may to many seem incredible, by the following question:—

'Who needs to be informed that there are myriads of facts, recorded in history and believed by all sound reasoners, which *à priori* arguments would have pronounced fables? The reasons which render the whole affair credible and natural are often hidden in the darkness of a remote age.'—P. 138.

We trust our readers will excuse us for dwelling somewhat at length on this odd scheme for making Congregationalism out to be of apostolical origin. Hug, a modern Romanist, is quoted to prove that the Jews were banished from Rome by Claudius, and that the Christians were swept away with them. But how this bears upon the main question we are not informed. And then Ignatius is quoted, yet without specifying the passage, as showing that at Antioch, in the second century, there was 'but one congregation of the faithful.' Next comes a notable argument indeed, drawn from the fact of Paul of Samosata, when deposed, 'refusing to resign the Church's house, not houses, *ἐκκλησίας οἶκον*'[1]! (P. 139.) Tertullian and Cyprian are then boldly cited in favour of the same hypothesis, and Dr. Bennett concludes with taking it for granted to have been proved, and proceeds to speculate upon the causes, after having freely acknowledged that 'all this is, indeed, surprising!' (P. 139.) In some future edition of the Lectures, when public opinion is somewhat more enlightened, possibly Dr. Bennett may find even the words of Irenæus suitable to his purpose: '*ταύτην τὴν πιστὶν, ὡς προέφαμεν, ἡ Ἐκκλησία, καίπερ ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ κόσμῳ διεσπαρμένη, ἐπιμελῶς φυλάσσει, ὡς ἕνα οἶκον οἰκοῦσα.*'—*S. Irenæus, Reg. Fidei.*

Upon this sandy foundation our Congregational Lecturer ventures to raise rather a huge structure, borrowing somewhat irreverently, our blessed Lord's words, 'Let him that readeth understand,' as an introduction to his own peculiar dogma, that 'wherever there was a Church there was a bishop; and wherever there was a congregation, there was a Church.' Assuming the truth of this, he tells us that 'the bishops of the cities laid violent hands on hundreds or thousands of Churches, and killed them outright!' Then unable to resist the temptation, he

'Punishes the Pope for Cæsar's crimes,'

and argues that, whatever the State now does to annihilate bishops, bishops cannot complain of, because, a thousand or fifteen hundred years ago, bishops set the example! Still gathering confidence as he goes on, the Doctor then asserts

[1] 'Probably the bishop's residence and the cathedral under one roof.'—*Archdeacon Evans, Biog. of Early Church.* Series 2, p. 344.

that 'a Church, consisting of the indiscriminate mass of a 'nation where the great majority have no semblance of Chris-'tian character, would have astounded the early Fathers.' Even if this were true, we might ask Dr. Bennett, for once, to turn from the Fathers to Holy Scripture itself. There, in more than one similitude to which the kingdom of heaven is likened by the Lord of that kingdom, the preponderance of the evil over the good within it is but too clearly indicated. If 'many are called, few are chosen.'

We must bespeak the reader's patience, while we go somewhat more fully into the Congregational theory of Christian antiquity, and endeavour to show how reluctantly it is made to yield anything approaching to a development of 'Independent Churches.' Here are a few fresh specimens. After a premonitory but perplexing warning, that 'in the view of the 'early Church,' the office of deacon 'was so combined with that 'of bishop that it will be difficult to keep them distinct' (p. 143), the Lecturer quotes the well-known passage of Clemens Romanus, 'The apostles, preaching through countries and 'cities, constituted their first-fruits, having proved them by the 'Spirit, for bishops and deacons of those that should believe.' This is quoted to prove that 'only two kinds of officers are here mentioned.' We may be mistaken, but as we count them there are three, viz.: 1st, apostles; 2d, bishops; 3d, deacons. And this agrees well enough with Theodoret's assertion that in the early 'times the priests were called 'bishops, and those whom we now call bishops, apostles; but 'in process of time the name of apostle was restricted to those 'that are indeed apostles, while the name of bishop was appro-'priated to those that had formerly had the name of apostles.' But Dr. Bennett knows better than this, and ignoring the name and office of an apostle altogether, boasts of the Fathers being in perfect harmony with the Scriptures, because 'the 'directions given to Timothy and Titus enjoin only the two 'orders of bishops and deacons!' (P. 146.) The obvious question, 'What were Timothy and Titus?' might draw forth a reply which would upset the whole hypothesis. Nay, Dr. Bennett himself mentions in one place (p. 153) 'presbyters or elders who episcopised over the flock.' Elsewhere he repeatedly implies *elders* who did *not* 'episcopise,' and *deacons*. And here, after all, though in rather an awkward way, we get pretty near to the truth. But this is not quite what Dr. Bennett means. Afterwards he develops his idea of 'a presbyter or elder who episcopises' into the concrete form of a 'presbyter-bishop,' more than one of which presbyter-bishops, he asserts, often were found in a single Church, and each of

these he takes for the primitive model of what we now call a Congregational Teacher. We believe that we are doing justice to his theory, but it is rather obscure in itself and not very clearly laid down; besides which we wish to be as brief as justice will allow. It will, perhaps, be fairest to let Dr. Bennett speak for himself on this point. After having owned (p. 146) that S. Ignatius mentions three orders, he says, that, 'at length' (*i.e.* about A.D. 107) 'the double names of presbyter 'and bishop were employed to create two offices,' and after quoting St. Jerome[1] in proof of this being merely an ecclesiastical arrangement, Dr. Bennett notices two evils that followed this imaginary change: 'First, the bishop absorbs the ruling 'power, though the apostle commands Christians to obey as 'rulers none but those who spake to them the word of God; 'and secondly, the presbyter, pastor, or preacher, is placed 'under another minister, for which no Scriptural authority is 'pretended except by the absurd process of making bishops 'successors to the apostles.' (P. 158.) How quietly the absence of all Scriptural authority and the absurdity of the process referred to are taken for granted! How coolly the Doctor assumes that bishops do *not* speak unto us the word of God, or at least that a command to obey those that do this is equivalent to a command to obey *none but these!*

Presbyter-bishops, as the Lecturer terms them, were in the very early times (he says) equivalent to ministers of his own denomination. And thus he ventures to claim even 'the Clements and Polycarps of ancient days' (p. 292), in spite of their phœnixes and heathenism, as glorious specimens of Independent ministers! At the same time he might fairly have noticed with approbation the 'liberality' of S. Ignatius, who, though he 'paraded,' like a child, 'his new toy of prelacy,' yet never finds fault, in his epistle to S. Polycarp, with the still newer toy which, according to Dr. Bennett, the latter had discovered. Yet the good bishop of Antioch might have, perchance, intended to hit the presbyter-bishop of Smyrna, when he wrote as follows:—'Hearken unto the bishop, that 'God also may hearken unto you. My soul be security for 'them that submit to their bishop, with their presbyters and deacons.' (S. Ignatius to Polycarp, sec. vi. Archbishop Wake's Translation.) Again, when, on the Lecturer's showing, there was strife for the name of bishop, and this strife

[1] It is only justice to S. Jerome to quote the following 'insignem sententiam', as Bishop Pearson calls it:—'Ut sciamus traditiones apostolicas sumptas de 'Veteri Testamento, quod Aaron et filii ejus atque Levitæ in templo fuerunt, hoc 'sibi episcopi, et presbyteri, et diaconi in Ecclesiâ vindicent.' (Epist. 146, *ad fin.* quoted in Bishop Pearson's Min. Theol. Works, vol. ii. p. 74.

was 'the rage of the day' in S. Ignatius's time, who asserted what was almost 'impious,' in order to 'establish an exclusive 'monarchy in each Church' (p. 156), it does seem strange that S. Polycarp, though a 'presbyter-bishop,' showed no signs of disapproval of the change that was going on in the Church. Only fancy Dr. Owen receiving an epistle from Archbishop Laud before his martyrdom, in which he was addressed as 'bishop' (*minus* the affixed 'presbyter'), and his people told to 'submit themselves to their bishop, presbyters, and deacons!' But we fear the faith of Dr. Bennett is not easily to be shaken. There is no choice but that between the myth of Congregationalism in S. Polycarp's time, and the stubborn fact of the rise of the Brownists in Queen Elizabeth's days! So our Doctor is tempted to prefer the former, and makes free to assert of the earliest Fathers, here including even S. Ignatius,[1] that—

'This was their idea of a Church: as remote from what is now 'called a Church by those who glory in the Fathers, as the 'living body is from the mangled, scattered fragments of—'Orpheus'! (P. 160.)

Notwithstanding all this assertion, however, and in spite of the curious discovery that no one 'can intelligently read 'Cyprian's Treatise on the Unity of the Church without per-'ceiving that its author had a Congregational Church in his 'eye' (p. 188), the theory of the 'Primitive Congregationalists' is not very formidable. Bishop is a very awkward word for men like Dr. Bennett to handle, and presbyter is nearly as bad, for how often is it only old priest, written large! So, when the Independent Lecturer puts the two words together, and out of them manufactures his 'presbyter-bishop,' he reminds us of a child playing, not with 'a new toy,' but with a couple of edged tools! And the result is similarly disastrous. For instance, the same simplicity and rashness which rails at S. Ignatius for his hierarchical notions, boasts of the Congregational Churches being 'the original Churches, not only of the Scriptures, but of the first three hundred years' (p. 273); and in the very opposite page admits, 'such men as Ainsworth, Goodwin, and Owen, '*the first theologians of their day*' (!), to be '*our founders.*'

Before we finally quit this subject, we are tempted to refresh ourselves and our readers with one brief quotation from an Anglican divine upon what Dr. Bennett assumes all along, namely, 'the original identity of bishop and presbyter.'

[1] Evidently S. Ignatius puzzles our author. Here he claims his assent to the theory of Primitive Congregationalism. Elsewhere, characteristically enough, he says, 'The epistles of Ignatius prepared the way for Hildebrand, who might 'find in them an apology for his most atrocious language. To adopt the phraseo-'logy in homœopathy, the millesimal portion of this spirit would suffice to poison 'a world!' (P. 261.)

'And what if they should be so, *iidem πρεσβύτεροι qui ἐπίσκοποι*; the first, the name of their age and order; the latter, of their office and duty? does he think to fright your bishops with this? does this affect the cause of episcopacy? How then came Theodoret, a bishop, Theophylact, an archbishop, and Chrysostom, a patriarch, not to be aware of it, when they expressly *affirm* what our writer would have appear? They, with all Christian antiquity, never thought themselves and their order to succeed the Scripture *ἐπίσκοποι*, but the Scripture *ἀπόστολοι*; they were *διάδοκοι τῶν Ἀποστόλων*; the successors of the Apostles.' —*Bentley's Phileleutherus Lipsiensis*, pp. 135-6.

The whole passage, though too long to transcribe, will well repay the pains of referring to it. And Bentley's reply to those who call presbyters bishops, appears to us to settle the question:—

'The time has been' (he says,) 'when a commander even of a single regiment was called *Imperator*; and must every such now-a-days set up to be *Emperors?* The one pretence is altogether as just as the other.'—*Phil. Lips.* p. 137.

Our hasty sketch of the way in which 'the theology of the Early Christian Church' is 'exhibited' by Dr. Bennett, 'in quotations from the writers of the first three centuries,' would be very imperfect were we to pass over the subject of the sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, 'ritual observances,' which our author appears almost to oppose to 'the work of Christ or His Spirit' (p. 190). In the same page he tells us that 'the Latin Church derived the word *sacrament* 'not from Scripture, but from heathen Rome, as the Greeks 'also borrowed from paganism their term *mystery*.' At any rate the latter term is found in the New Testament, and the question is not about the words *sacrament* and *mystery*, but the things which the Church has always held these words to signify. To begin, then, with Dr. Bennett's exhibition of Justin Martyr's doctrine concerning holy baptism. This is a curiosity in its way. After quoting the well-known passage in his Second Apology, where Justin unequivocally identifies baptism with regeneration and illumination, the Congregational Lecturer endeavours to prove his point that both parties may 'claim Justin's suffrage' by a very peculiar process of which we acknowledge this to be by far the worst example we have met with in the whole book. Justin is immediately afterwards quoted as elsewhere asking Trypho—'What is circumcision to 'me who have the testimony of God? What need of baptism 'to him who is baptised with the Holy Spirit?' Dr. Bennett is, for the most part, particular in giving his references. Here, however, no reference is given. But, upon turning to the Dialogue with Trypho translated by H. Browne, and published by Bickersteth in 'The Christian Fathers,' we find the passage as follows at sect. xxix.: 'God hath shown His good-will 'towards the Gentiles, and more readily accepts our offerings

'and sacrifices than yours. What occasion, then, can I, who 'have God's approbation, have for this circumcision of yours? 'of what use can this baptism[1] of yours be to us, who are 'baptized with the Holy Ghost?'

This passage, according to the Lecturer, 'represents the 'change in the person's state from an unbeliever to a believer, as 'the antecedent, not the consequence of baptism.' Bishop Kaye quotes it (p. 90, note) as opposed to the washings of the Mosaic ritual, and he mentions another passage which we give below,[2] since it may throw light on the meaning of the former, as being opposed to circumcision. And now we may leave it to the reader to decide which way the quotation really tells, and to settle what adjective may best designate Dr. Bennett's management of it. Meanwhile, we take leave to affirm that Justin clearly states that spiritual circumcision is received by Christians in holy baptism, and in this appointed way is open to all. And we beg to contrast this plain fact with the following very questionable reasoning of our author:—'The Martyr 'could not mean to intimate that baptism conferred either 'regeneration or pardon, when he asked Trypho, "What need 'of baptism to him who is baptised of the Holy Spirit?" We 'are sure he did not wish to discard the rite as useless, and 'therefore must conclude that he intended to exhibit the 'baptism of the Spirit as preceding, and as that which saves; 'so that the absolute necessity of water-baptism to salvation is 'here denied.' (P. 192-3.) 'Baptism,' he goes on to say, 'is 'called illumination, not as conferring that blessing, but as 'conferred on the illuminated. By parity of reason, the baptism 'is called regeneration, as it is performed on men who have been 'regenerated.' So, 'by parity of reason,' might Socinians argue that Christ is called our salvation, 'not as conferring that blessing,' but as conferred on the 'saved.' Or it might be said, with 'parity of reason,' though in the very face of S. Paul's words, that baptism is called the putting on of Christ, 'as it is performed on men who have "put on Christ."'

We will not weary our readers with any further specimens of Nonconformist argument on this subject of holy baptism. The following brief quotation may serve as a specimen of Dr. Bennett's sneers: 'If we believe all that these Fathers say,

[1] It is worth noticing that Rowland Williams, in his notorious 'Essay,' paraphrases Justin's ἁγίῳ πνεύματι βεβαπτισμένῳ by 'mental baptism.'—*Essays and Reviews*, p. 64, n. s. ed.

[2] 'We, who through Him [Christ] have access to God, have not received that 'circumcision which is in the flesh, but that spiritual circumcision which Enoch 'and others like him observed. And this we, because we have been sinners, do 'through the mercy of God receive by baptism; and in the same manner may 'all others receive it.' (See *Just. M. Opera*, p. 261, *Browne's Trans.* sec. 43.)

'which is more than they did themselves, we must conclude 'that the heathen poet anticipated the truth, when he said, '*ἄριστον μὲν ὕδωρ.*' (P. 196.) In a like spirit he owns that 'the baptized are said to be illuminated and adopted, per-'fected, immortalised, made gods.' 'The heathen apotheosis'! according to Dr. Bennett. (P. 196.) And lastly he ventures to speak of the 'profound silence of the apostolical Fathers on the subject of baptism.' (P. 202.) *E.g. S. Ignatius ad Smyrn.* cap. 8: *Οὐκ ἐξόν ἐστι, χωρὶς τοῦ ἐπισκόπου οὔτε βαπτίζειν, οὔτε ἀγάπην ποιεῖν.* Or again at cap. 18, "Ος [*ὁ Χριστὸς*] *ἐγεννήθη καὶ ἐβαπτισθη, ἵνα τῷ πάθει τὸ ὕδωρ καθαρίσῃ.* S. Clement of Rome also speaks of 'Noah preach-'ing regeneration to the world,' besides mentioning baptism elsewhere as a thing 'to be kept pure and undefiled, if we would enter into the palace of God.'[1] Other instances might easily be adduced, but we have chosen two or three of the shortest passages, which appeared quite sufficient to show 'the profound silence of the apostolical Fathers on the subject of Baptism.' An assertion that reminds us of a similarly bold declaration which we once heard, that Holy Scripture said marvellously little about baptism, and nothing at all about the Church! In both cases it is to be feared that the wish was father to the thought!

After a bold assertion that 'modern confirmation is as remote 'from the practice of the early Fathers, as from the doctrine of 'the Scriptures' (p. 203, *note*), our Lecturer proceeds to treat of the views of the Fathers of the first three centuries concerning the Lord's Supper. On this subject his remarks are very meagre and commonplace, so they will not detain us long. He accuses Justin Martyr of 'departures from Scripture,' in the account that writer gives of the administration of the Eucharist, and then apologises for him, after a fashion, in the following question: 'But what accuracy can we expect from one who 'makes the Holy Spirit a mediator, through whom we offer our 'prayers?' (P. 205.) The mixed cup is, of course, excepted against, for 'Christ said nothing of water.'[2] And, lastly, it is stated that 'the Church of Rome, by denying the cup to the 'laity, has taken away from them Clement's *panacea of immor-'tality*, which is in the water chiefly; and in an inferior way, 'in the wine.' (P. 207.) Before we quit the subject, it may be worth while to quote from a book, written by one now in holy orders, but born and educated among the Congregationalists, a

[1] See the quotations in Vernon Harcourt's 'Doctrine of the Deluge,' vol. ii. p. 57*b*.

[2] In Lightfoot's opinion, 'that cup which Christ used was mixed with water, if so be He retained the ordinary custom of the nation in this matter, which is not in the least to be doubted.'

different view of the whole matter. Chapin's book, though stereotyped in America, is not known here so well as it deserves to be. 'The right to administer the Holy Eucharist, according to this writer, 'could only be derived from the Apostles or their 'successors: authority to consecrate the elements in the Eucharist 'having been originally given only to the Twelve.—Thus, at the 'time of the celebration of the last Supper, Jesus said to His 'apostles, "I appoint you a kingdom, as my Father hath 'appointed unto Me, that [or, *in order that*] ye may eat and 'drink at My table, in My kingdom."—"I make over, or appoint 'to you, *as by bequest*, the kingdom I have received from My 'Father." And the reason given us that they might be able to 'eat and drink at that table which He had spread; that is, 'might have power and authority to consecrate and set apart 'the elements of bread and wine, so that they should become 'sacramentally His Body and Blood, as He Himself had declared 'them to be.' (*See Chapin's View of the Organisation and Order 'of the Primitive Church*, p. 162.)

We had marked several other subjects in Dr. Bennett's Lectures, which would have thrown some additional light on Congregational views and Congregational theology. But space will not admit of our noticing these in detail. One quotation from a fellow lecturer, Scott, we would recommend to Dr. Bennett's serious consideration. The former, referring to the subject of evil spirits, meets the objections of those that deny there is any spirit, by stating how improbable *à priori* it is, that 'the Teacher who came from God, and who appeared in our 'nature, should have left this interesting subject so much in 'the dark, that, as relates to it, by far the greater number of 'His followers have wandered from the path of truth!'[1] If Dr. Bennett and those who agree with him would apply this improbability to some of the leading peculiarities of Congregationalism, we think they would themselves be startled to find how all Christians, in every age and every country, must have been mistaken and misled, upon their hypothesis, in the points at issue between them and their brethren.

And yet, to do the Congregationalist Lecturer justice, he is ready enough sometimes to bow to the voice of a multitude. Reproving our present system of patronage, he says that 'the civil ruler now *creates* bishops,' and that, 'in defiance of the 'ancient ecclesiastical maxim, the voice of the people is no 'longer considered the voice of God.' (P. 170.) This is a sweeping rule, wherever it comes from; but as it is only propounded as an 'ecclesiastical maxim,' *valeat quantum*. It suggests, however, rather forcibly, the contrast between the 'multitu-

[1] W. Scott. 'Lectures on the Existence of Evil Spirits,' p. 5, ed. 1853.

'dinism'[1] of the Church and the 'multitudinism' of the meeting-house. The man of the meeting-house almost always takes the *popular* side, and seems scarcely able to separate the idea of truth from the idea of what is held by the multitude of the present day. The Churchman realises Dr. Bennett's 'ecclesiastical maxim' in a very different way. And his *vox populi* is (if we may so speak) the more populous *vox* of the two. For one test of truth which he uses is the fact of an opinion or doctrine having been held '*semper, ubique, et ab omnibus.*'

One more feature of the book before us—trifling it may be, yet characteristical—must not be passed over. This is the peculiarity of the writer's style—its ambitiousness and its coarseness. Of the former we will submit the following specimens. After blaming the early Christians—the very men he elsewhere appeals to in favour of Congregationalism—for 'imitating the Jewish priesthood,' Dr. Bennett accuses them of having 'soon 'left the model of the temple far behind, by a list of dignities, 'archdeacons, deans, archbishops, primates, patriarchs, cardinals, 'and popes, for which not a single example could be found, 'either in synagogue or temple. But this,' he adds, 'was no dis-'couragement; for *after having gone through the constellation Can-'cer*, so far as to become semi-Jews, they rushed all the way to the 'beggarly elements of the world.' (P. 181.) So again, after tracing 'the mania for allegory, which at length Judaized or Paganized the Christian Church' to S. Clement of Rome—as if there were no allegories in Holy Scripture!—he vents his anger against the same S. Clement for comparing the Jewish temple and the Christian Church. A comparison, according to the Independent Lecturer, which 'proved the box of Pandora out of which innumerable evils flew.' (P. 11.)

From these grandiloquent specimens of learning and science we turn reluctantly to contemplate for a moment some of the coarser features of our author's style. We can excuse him for rendering ἐξεῖπον by the homely word 'blabbed.' (P. 97.) We accept his unusual praise of Clement of Alexandria, even though it is couched in the following peculiar expression: 'Agreeably 'surprised by finding such a jewel in a dunghill, we envy not 'those who prefer the dunghill to the jewel.' (P. 126.) We can pardon the Doctor's funny translation of *deacons* into *waiters*, which, however, he tells us were 'not ordinary waiters at tables, where men eat and drink, but ministers of the Church of God.' (P. 147.) Nay, we are not so particular as to be unable to tolerate—though we do not like it—the expression of a 'de-

[1] We ask pardon of our readers for borrowing and re-appropriating a slang term from the Oxford 'Reviewer,' Mr. Wilson.

parture from apostolic precedent being laid naked.' (P. 159.) But we must protest against Dr. Bennett's irreverence, when (p. 245) he speaks of what he calls 'the ugly ideas of the ancients,' and tries to convict us ('obsequious worshippers' of the Fathers) of disregard to their authority, because we shrink with horror from the Doctor's translation from one of them, in which he unceremoniously applies the expression 'an ugly face' to Him of whom it is written, 'Thou art fairer than the children of men, full of grace are thy lips.'

But it is time to bring these remarks to a close. We hope and believe that Dr. Bennett's is not an average specimen of the 'Congregational Lectures.' One of the series, at least, already quoted—namely 'Scott on the Existence of Evil Spirits'—appears to be deserving of notice, and in some future number we may be tempted to consider its merits. But of Dr. Bennett's Lectures we take leave with a feeling of disappointment. We took them up with a sincere desire of knowing what Congregationalism has to say for itself in connexion with 'the theology of the Early Christian Church.' And we put them down again almost with a feeling of disappointment at finding on what slender foundations this popular form of Dissent has to rest—even upon the showing of its own champions. Certainly, if antiquity has anything to do with the question of ecclesiastical or religious truth, it would seem as if no cross-examination—no rack nor torture even—could draw from it any witness in favour of the sect whose 'founders' were 'Ainsworth, Goodwin, and Owen'—to say nothing of Brown!

ART. V.—1. *Autobiography and Correspondence of Mrs. Delany.* London: Bentley.
2. *Autobiography, Letters, and Literary Remains of Mrs. Piozzi.* London: Longmans.

THERE is at least an apparent propriety in taking the works at the head of our article together. They belong to the same class of literature, and thus seem to give one another importance and a purpose. They may be said exactly to divide the gossip of the eighteenth century between them, and to give us a picture of its social life, such as only women can give, and which very materially adds to our power of realizing its tone and aspect; by turns modifying, correcting, and strengthening our previous impressions, and giving life to the whole. Diffuse and often trifling as both works are, full of superfluous and unnecessary matter, they yet leave us with ideas enlarged; we feel that we have learnt something; yet both seem to require apology, and need to be accounted for. We are disposed of each in turn to ask why it is published now. What circumstances then can at the same time have brought to light letters and documents which, having slumbered so long, might seem to have passed the period of possible resuscitation? Each editor has no doubt a good and different reason to give for the intrusion upon the latter half of our century of a name of such mild lustre even in her own day as Mrs. Delany's, and of such questionable celebrity as that of Mrs. Piozzi, and may establish a distinct claim on public attention; but one thing is certain, that if the obsolete system of buying books before we read them still prevailed we should have no such coincidence. Neither of these old ladies could possibly have appeared again upon the scene. Public libraries generally, and Mr. Mudie in particular, must be the occasion of such publications as those before us; and we recognise something even judicial in the three enormous volumes, two thousand ample pages in all, which embody Mrs. Delany's experience. It must be for Mr. Mudie's sins that a woman's private letters of more than a hundred years old should be given to the world in such unmeasured unexampled profusion. No person whose name and family does not occur in the select and aristocratic circle of her friends and intimates, would dream of buying a mass of correspondence, half of which was devoted to trifles so perfectly immaterial and unimportant at the time, except to the person addressed, that no lapse of years can make it curious, or give it adventitious value. But every reader of the literature of the day will want to see the books which hold

in solution a great deal that is both curious and interesting. It is just the work to be in universal demand; not to be read through page by page—though after all that is the best way if people have the art of reading quickly—but to be dipped into for the chance of a well-known name, a telling anecdote, a trait of obsolete manners, a glimpse of old-world splendours. Mr. Mudie is pledged to a supply in proportion to the demand wherever his sectarian convictions do not interfere with the liberality of his scheme—he must therefore have had to order a very large and costly supply of Mrs. Delany's correspondence. Again the prestige that still attends Dr. Johnson's name makes it a necessity that every one should know the last facts that can possibly be told of him from a reliable, or at any rate a genuine source, if it can be done without loading our shelves with more books about him: for his sake therefore the reader willingly skims the poor remains and gleanings of long-ago gathered recollections; and submits to follow the details of Mrs. Piozzi's sprightly, but not very reverent old age, for the chance of passing allusions and fresh combinations of names whose sole interest now lies in their association with the great social wonder of his time. Probably these volumes will lie but a short time within each one's reach—the suggestions therefore of a more systematic reading may supply some of the deficiencies of a passing and careless perusal.

The attempt to revive the more than half-forgotten names of two old ladies, will at least have a temporary success. Both books are suggestive, as the picture of any life whatever must be, but these had both a distinctness and a vigour in their several ways, and were passed under such circumstances of note and observation as fit them particularly for subjects of speculation. Regarding life not as a probation, but as a performance, they show us some of the elements of success and of failure in a marked manner. While a certain parallel may be drawn between the external position of these two women, the events of their lives, the place they once held, the notice and admiration they once excited, and the intellectual superiority attributed to them; the mode in which they used the advantages and met the difficulties of their lot, constitute as strong a difference as can well be found. Their portraits as old women, which stand at the opening of their works, prefigure and define this difference—though thirty years' distance in date may possibly diminish its full significance. Mrs. Delany, in coif and hood, comely and venerable, model of a wise, pious, decorous, acquiescent old age: Mrs. Piozzi, at nearly the same time of life, in hat and plumes, and false flaxen curls, to which her chronicler in candour bids us add, cheeks violently rouged. Each face is the type of a character and a career: in Mrs. Delany, of a harmony which is the

characteristic of her life, adapting her to every successive stage of existence, causing her to fit in with every change and be always in keeping with the seasons of life as they came and passed by, from the tearful April and glowing May of her youth to the fall of Autumn and December snows: in Mrs. Piozzi's of exactly opposite characteristics—of a total want of this harmony and of the resolute hitch in her nature which disturbed all proportions; telling of a precocious womanhood, a girlish middle life, and a frivolous and fantastic old age. The one picture represents the gift of self-government, founded on a calm and modest self-reliance, the other that total incapacity for self-guidance, which so often is seen where vanity holds possession in the place of self-respect—the craving for the approbation or admiration of others rather than a wish to satisfy the individual judgment.

We are not attributing these differences wholly to an intrinsic superiority in one over the other. Circumstances seem to have been in the elder lady's favour, as they were against Mrs. Piozzi. It is not many people who know how to manage a borrowed and reflected consequence, or who, being once raised above their merits, can either be judicious under the fictitious elevation, or descend gracefully into obscurity. Probably Mrs. Delany's view of what she owed to herself, would under any circumstances have withheld her from devoting herself to a great name or a great man of any kind; she would not have disorganized her household, or deranged her hours, or broken her habits, for any colossus under the sun. She would have fully estimated Dr. Johnson, and given him a fair share of her respect, time, and affection; but no monopoly, nothing to derange the completeness and consistency of her own life, as to detract from the rights of other friends and other claims. But we can hardly blame Mrs. Thrale for the zeal of her devotion for a man at once so great and so dependent as Dr. Johnson, an object of such joint admiration and compassion. He was as it were a charge committed to her by her husband, by society, and by himself; and yet there is no doubt that her own life was unhinged by it. The necessity of soothing his wayward moments, of cheering his melancholy hours; the inevitable longing for his approval, the constant strain to meet his intellect, to answer his expectations, to entertain him by wit and readiness; to win his flattery, to avoid his blame; the perpetual stimulants to vanity, on the one hand, and on the other, the wounds to self-respect which he could not help inflicting on those around him, and which had to be borne with a mixture of noble and mean, high and low motives; the subservience, in fact, in which all had to live who lived much with Johnson, all inevitably disturbed the right balance, and unfitted those subject to it to a wise conduct in their own affairs. Besides,

we must believe that a life of talk of any kind, a life of conversation, a life spent in hearing and saying wise things, or witty things, or silly things—perhaps it does not so much matter which, as may at first be supposed—a life where the tongue is kept going, and the ears are on the alert, and the spirits are excited, and the showy faculties kept on the stretch for immediate display—is in itself and for the things neglected by it demoralizing; it cannot be done with impunity—self-restraint and reasoning power, vigour of mind and strength of will are impaired by it. We cannot wish that Johnson had talked less; that gigantic effort and long silent labour, his dictionary, seems to justify a gigantic relaxation, but we suspect the readers of his wonderful talk have been greater gainers by it than those who hung day after day upon his lips: certainly Boswell ever since has been a proverb for a fool, and Mrs. Thrale, after enjoying this supreme pleasure and privilege for twenty years, fell desperately in love, as soon as she was her own mistress, with a singing master, who had nothing to say, and said that nothing in vile broken English, and who did not even understand what she said to him in reply. So much had the long stream of exquisite thought in exquisite language poured into her ear in such wealth and profusion as never woman was regaled with before, done for her, in the way of educating her mind, refining her taste, and ennobling her heart.

Mrs. Delany's course offers a very different spectacle; there are no mistakes, no lapses, no blunders. She never shocked her friends by a departure from their previous conception. Indeed, a certain halo played round her which we hardly understand. Ballard, for instance, chose her as the woman in England to whom to dedicate his 'British Ladies,' without any personal knowledge, simply from her reputation as fulfilling the ideal woman of her own time. And here we recognize that good fortune which distinguishes her from Mrs. Piozzi. Her qualities essentially fitted her for her own age; she could hardly have made so great a stir in ours, though such a nature would adapt itself to all circumstances. She was one of those wise persons who make the best of their own times, without too violent an effort to mend them. Reformers are a very useful and necessary class, but they do not attract the praise and veneration of those who have most to do with them, and they are apt to acquire embarrassing and provoking habits, if they do not start with them. There are, it is true, in these volumes mild protests against the vices of the time; we find excellent reflections on its peculiar vanities and follies: but she, nevertheless, takes the general view of things for granted, and makes the best of it, as of all the circumstances arising out of this view which befal

herself, which, in her opening life, were very trying and awkward indeed. But she was always able to see them exactly for what they were. She had no romance to exaggerate evil, or to raise impossible schemes for emancipation. She could, in the heyday of youth, take the good with the bad, and make the best of compensations. She never felt herself the sport of circumstances, as impulsive natures under misfortune are apt to do. She had self-possession in the fullest sense of the word, and was mistress of herself; realizing herself as something separate, distinct, her own—which no one could take from her—which she must defend, protect, and develop; not, of course, that she knew or thought all this, but she acted upon a class of impressions which belong to some persons, and not to others—which constitute a very marked, fundamental difference in those who are actuated by them. As an instance of what we mean, this Mary Granville, daughter of the second son of a noble family, is compelled, at seventeen, to marry 'Gromeo,' as her autobiography calls him —in other words, Mr. Pendarves, a Cornish squire, sixty years old, of large, unwieldy person, crimson countenance, repulsive manners, and intemperate habits. Her uncle, Lord Lansdowne, forces her to it. Clear-sighted beyond her years, of a noble, truthful nature, conscious, we do not doubt, of her own merits, he has the power to subdue her resistance, and to induce her to conceal her shuddering repugnance—not from the bridegroom, to whom she is careful by manner, at least, to convey her real feelings, but—from her parents, who are summoned to the wedding. The lax view of marriage prevailing at that time, which regarded it as a mere bargain in which inclination had no part, was pushed to its extreme in her case. She knew she was sacrificed, she felt herself a victim, and she must soon have learnt that the transaction had not her future prospects in view so much as her uncle's political interests; for, with the habitual carelessness of selfishness, he trusted to the bridegroom's promises and professions, and the great fortune which had been promised her, and which was the avowed motive for the match, went to the heir-at-law. But none of this produced any useless resentment; she probably thought that *noblesse oblige;* she realized the advantage of high birth, took the penalty, and remained always on respectful and affectionate terms with her uncle to the day of his death. Her deportment to her husband and acceptance of her lot are in the same spirit. He takes her to his castle in Cornwall—a great tumble-down place, probably very romantic, but of which the parlour-floor was rotten and the ceiling falling in. The poor girl's heart for a moment fails her; she bursts into tears, which is a departure from the demeanour she had prescribed to herself. Poor Gromeo is really concerned, and

allows her to repair and furnish the old place as she pleases. This was the best form of relief that could have been prescribed; she owns that it helped to amuse her greatly. Congenial surroundings, a suitable atmosphere, was always necessary to her, as it is to the natures with whom we class her. She made the best of her position and of Gromeo; but she never deluded herself about him. She never worked herself up into any frame of mind. She never pretended to see things in a coloured light. She obeyed him scrupulously; she submitted to his caprices; she carefully respected his not unnatural jealousy. She was a model of propriety in a lax age, and under unusual temptations. She nursed him; she read to him for hours at a time, shivering in the winter cold, when the fires of the gout made him endure no other fire; but she never pretended, either to him or to herself, to *care* for him. He knew when he married her that it was against her will, and in the teeth of a violent repugnance; all the seven years of their married life, we gather that he might, and probably did, know the same. She took care, on the one hand, to conceal her *tears;* but, on the other, was as resolute to 'show no delight in his company.' 'Gromeo,' she writes, 'who really loved me, was 'much concerned to see me so melancholy on the loss of my 'father, but that was no consolation to me.' For two years he abstained from the bottle, possibly with some hope of favour, and then relapsed into old habits with old companions; and finally, after a bout with his old set, was found one morning dead by her side. He had the very night before shown some presentiment of what was coming; commended her as a good wife, and proposed to her to ring for witnesses to his will made in her favour. But hers was no sordid nature; she saw he was ill and low, and persuaded him to wait till the next day. Nor does she ever show any regret for the loss of a large estate. She writes to her friend the Duchess of Portland, who had asked for these details of her early life: 'After being married 'seven years, I became a widow—a state, you may believe, not 'unwelcome,' though the shock of such a death told for a time; but 'my natural good spirits, time, and finding myself free from 'many vexations, soon brought me to a state of tranquillity I had 'not known for many years. As to my fortune, it was very me-'diocre, but it was *at my own command.*' The italics are her own.

Such a person did not need wealth to assert her right position; she only wanted independence, for which in her case the state of widowhood was essential. Henceforward she was never guided but by her own judgment. She resided first with an uncle and aunt, Sir John and Lady Stanley, afterwards in a house of her own; and from this time took her place amongst the women of highest rank, fashion, and reputation of the day. Her letters

give us a glimpse of the society, and especially of the women, of the period between the respective dates of the 'Spectator,' the 'Rambler,' and Richardson's novels, as far as we can accept the last as a picture of fashionable life.

There is an impression of sweetness and choiceness thrown over the coterie who form her immediate friends and allies which is very attractive: they group themselves into fine combinations—the magnificence in which they lived or shared sets them off. We are convinced that they were lovely, graceful, elegant, after a distinct and distinguished fashion which our more levelling days will not admit of. Gordeous to look upon, in their hours of state they wore their glittering attire with a sweeping grace which no width of crinoline can achieve now. To be observed and admired, to drive in coaches and six, to be attended by a bevy of devoted fine gentlemen, was so much their birthright, that notice influenced and moulded every movement, without making them vain. In this particular set, under Mrs. Pendarves' genial pen, we find no envy, jealousy, or meanness: they enhance one another's charms by a mutual adoration; they seek one another's society with constant friendship; they write volumes in absence; they consult one another's interest, and further each other's ends; they pursue pretty labours together; they sympathise, are merry, and sad together. There is no apparent affectation—it was before the age of blue-stockings—no straining after what is not theirs; but the serene content, the undoubting repose, induced by the knowledge that all that the world or society has to give is theirs already. They are evidently a set, a clique; they have names, grotesque, fanciful, or poetical, for themselves, and a cipher to express the outer world of their acquaintance. 'Penny,' 'Pipkin,' 'Colly,' 'Fidget,' the 'Twopennies,' are the Duchess of Portland's names for her friends and children. The 'Pearl' and 'Pearly-dews' are the epithets for Mrs. Delany's darling sister, Mrs. Dewes, to whom her letters are mainly addressed. Her cousins are, 'Violet,' 'Primrose,' 'Daisy;' while the pretty, clever, lively, accomplished Duchess of Portland, the centre of this group, is 'Our Duchess,' 'Our sweet Duchess,' 'Our well-beloved Duchess,' 'Our lovely Queen.' Herein, however, Mrs. Delany rather conforms to a fashion than invents one; for, except under the pressure of some unusual excitement, her style is grave; she treats what are now called trifles seriously. For she, no doubt, perceived that they were very far from trifles in the influences they possessed over the success of society and of individuals. The topic of dress, for instance, is treated with the gravity which its importance no doubt demanded, but which in our times no woman would have the courage to use. She might say as

much about it, and betray a deeper personal interest, but she would disguise it by an affectation of contempt for her theme. The subject of '*clothes*' with Mrs. Delany never meets with this injustice. It was, in fact, with her one of the fine arts. She had, probably, an exquisite taste in it, and in her early days, like the hapless Clarissa, exercised her invention, and struck out new thoughts. We see by the short and distinct directions she gives her sister in the country, that her judgment was final, and her authority law, as far as lady's attire was concerned; for she says —and it is characteristic of her main sympathies lying with her own sex—she never can remember men's clothes which made quite as bold a claim to attention in brightness of colours and splendour of material; sometimes dismissing them summarily with 'The men in general not remarkably fine,' or the reverse.

When ladies by their *head* meant not the throne of intellect and the seat of expression, but the bit of lace that surmounted and presided over them, we can hardly wonder that the vocabulary of the art generally should be weighty. 'Gauze heads,' we are told, 'are now the top mode;' and our prudent heroine does not think she is wasting her money when she gives fifty pounds, which would teach a language or an accomplishment, for a 'Brussels head.' There are pages of elaborate description of brocades of gold, and silver, and flowers, which read like more than mortal splendour, always written with the quiet conviction that they are as well worth describing as a fine picture. The very term *clothes* is a sort of voucher. 'He saw my clothes,' she writes of a beau who calls on her—'The Queen commended 'my clothes'—'My clothes were grave, a great pennyworth I 'happened to meet with; they cost me seventeen pounds'— 'There were many old clothes at Court.' Very rarely is there allusion to the effect of her magnificent get-up on others. She dresses in the mode due to herself and to the occasion. Only once do we notice excitement, a touch of levity, a momentary head-turning. It is at a time when she was receiving assiduous court from 'Herminius'—*i. e.* Lord Baltimore, the man who presumed to trifle with our fair young widow's feelings, to make love for five years, and to draw back so soon as he had fully satisfied himself that he had won her heart. Then she announces to her sister, 'I dressed myself in all my best array, borrowed 'Lady Sunderland's jewels, and made a tearing show. There 'was a vast crowd, and my Lady Carteret got with some diffi- 'culty to the circle, and, after she had made her courtesy, made 'me stand before her. The Queen came up to her, and thanked 'her for bringing me forward; and she told me she was *obliged* '*to me* for my pretty clothes, and admired my Lady Carteret's 'extremely: she told the Queen they were my fancy, and that 'I drew the pattern. Her Majesty said she had heard I could

'draw very well. . . . I suppose you will have some odd account 'of me. Let me know what they say of me behind my back.' This last sentence, betraying a little sheepish feminine vanity, is the only instance of the kind in these volumes. The Court then must have been a more satisfactory arena for such displays than it can be in the crush, bustle, and mixture of ranks a drawing-room is described to be now. At the public Court receptions then there was intercourse; it was society in a grand stately way. Everybody knew everybody. There was space to move in, to show clothes in; there was gossip with friends, and even with royalty itself. 'The King,' she writes, 'asked me many questions.' He was aware of her comings and goings. The Queen had even little pleasantries about her admirers. We are amused and surprised, now and then, by a tone and airs which imply a more easy state of things still. The Duchess of Queensberry was Mrs. Delany's contemporary cousin—Prior's 'Female Phaëton,' that 'Kitty beautiful and young,' who 'set the world on fire,' on her first appearance in it. These letters introduce her to us in the heyday of her beauty, which, indeed, seems to have been dazzling and altogether exceptional. Her caprices now and then draw upon her a notice of tender criticism. It seemed like vanity to Mrs. Delany that she should 'discard the borrowed aid that dress supplies,' and choose to appear, on occasions of splendour, in studied simplicity of attire, without a jewel about her. Writing of George the Second's coronation, she says, 'The Duchess of Queensberry depended so 'much on her native beauty, that she despised all adornment, 'nor had not one jewel, riband, or puff to set her off; but 'everybody thought she did not appear to advantage.' But the Duchess had her own view of things, and took her own way in most matters, which brought upon her amusing consequences. She chose to take up Gay, when his sequel to the 'Beggar's Opera' had brought him into disgrace with the Court, as seeming to reflect on the Government. In spite of this, she pleaded his cause; asked the King and Queen for subscriptions for him; and got herself forbid the Court in consequence—a thing never heard of to one of her rank. The Vice-Chamberlain was sent with the royal message, and returned with the following answer. We doubt whether duchesses, now-a-days, could express their feelings more readily or more clearly. They might possibly keep to the *third* person throughout, but it would be at more cost than consistency is worth; for the heart refuses to speak in that indirect, back-handed, coldly grammatical method.

'February 27, 1728-9.

'The Duchess of Queensberry is surprised and well pleased that the King hath given her so agreeable a command as to stay from Court, where she never

came for diversion, but to bestow a civility on the King and Queen. She hopes, by such an unprecedented order as this is, that the King will see as few as he wishes at his Court, particularly such as dare to think or speak truth. I dare not do otherwise, and ought not; nor could have imagined that it would not have been the very highest compliment that I could possibly pay the King to endeavour to support truth and innocence in his house, particularly when the King and Queen both told me that they had not read Mr. Gay's play. I have certainly done right then to stand by my own words, rather than his Grace of Grafton's, who hath neither made use of *truth, judgment, nor honour*, through this whole affair, either for himself or his friends.—C. QUEENSBERRY.'—*Autobiography and Correspondence of Mrs. Delany*, Vol. i. p. 194.

The grave comment on this effusion is, 'that though it shows spirit, it is not worded as her friends could have wished.' But the fair Kitty knew her own value. The loss of its greatest beauty, and most daring and lively spirit, was no trifle to the Court. 'My lady Harvey told her with a sneer, that now she was banished, the Court had lost its chief ornament.' 'I am entirely of your mind,' replied the Duchess, and probably she was right, as point is often made of her entertaining qualities. She lived to be banished from Court again, something about an apron she chose to wear, and which she flung in the Lord-in-Waiting's face; and also to shine there a dozen years later 'in all the magnificence of dress,' according to the poet's programme in such matters. Some one writes after describing the workmanship of her gown: 'Allowing for her age (then forty), I never saw so beautiful a creature.' We read of her later still, in the anguish of her eldest son's violent death almost before her eyes, and again with recovered spirits calling daily on Mrs. Delany to mix her medicines for her. But there was little in common between this erratic genius and the set we are particularly introduced to, the head of which, the Duchess of Portland, 'was to bring virtue into fashion if any one could.'

The picture of this lady and her family, which these letters present, is certainly a very agreeable one. The mixture of splendour and simplicity of manners could hardly be in our time, and characterises an age. Rank, in some respects, was a more evident and glaring possession then. Great people had monopolies of certain sensations; they figured in a more particular way before men's eyes; they, as it were, *wore* their coronets. Thus, when the Duke of Portland and his family migrated from Bulstrode to London, which they would now do by rail no faster, and in no greater privacy, than their neighbours, Mrs. Pendarves, who accompanied them, writes:—

'We set out from Bulstrode at eleven, and were in town by half an hour after two, over fields of snow and heaps of ice, but our horses flew as if each had been a Pegasus; four coaches and six with twelve horsemen attending, besides apothecaries, bakers and butchers that joined in the procession to escort us part of the way.'

A certain retinue, state, and publicity accompanies all their acts and movements; but the occupation of time and the family life is all simple and domestic—the children are brought up under the mother's eye; their education and dispositions are constantly in her mind. In the midst of constant necessary company, entertained with due splendour, the Duchess is always busy with her own little schemes of fancy and usefulness. Her mind is stored with recipes and nostrums. She delights in being out of doors. She observes flowers, and mosses and insects, and contrives all manner of devices to indulge her innate turn for work and invention. She and her friends are indeed alike in this, all are active spirits, full of business, occupied in their own affairs, taking a part in all the work going on about them, contriving, directing, managing, exhibiting the especial virtue of 'notableness' so often commended, and uniting in their persons 'the excellence of a good economist with the elegance of a fine lady,' both qualities alike indispensable. It is wonderful where the good ladies of these books, but more especially Mrs. Delany, found time for all they did; but it was before the intellectual and dreaming age. Reading was not regarded by any of them as the business of life: it came in by the by. They were read to now and then, or they reserved certain evening hours, between tea and cards; but the prime hours of the day, such as were not passed with the visitors who came early and staid long, and which were devoted to sitting at all, were spent in painting, *turning*, which was the Duchess's hobby, and needlework, which was one of Mrs. Delany's numerous specialities, as well as spinning, which seems to have been a favourite occupation with her and her mother; the fineness of the thread testifying to the quality of the spinster. We cannot doubt that if the claims of rank and society had not stood in the way, these ladies, in our own time, would have made a bevy of authoresses. All the cravings after expression which found satisfaction in painting and shell work, and feather work, and grottoes, and quilts, and beds, and curtains, and fringes, and patterns, and neat and appetizing bills of fare (an admitted subject for arrangement and invention), would have found another vent—would have resulted in tales—moral, didactic, romantic—in poems, in essays, in scientific dialogues, in educational treatises, in tracts, by means of which the ladies of our own time confer such benefits on the world. Grottoes, for instance—what a world of romance which the mind and customs of that aspect of society kept down, found room to expatiate in the construction of a grotto. In our youth we remember wondering at the age which could have found anything to please in the dank little dens, which, in gardens and ornamental grounds, were still considered points of attraction by the superannuated

guide. Mean, childish, insignificant to our uneducated eyes—suggestive not of hermits and serene contemplation, but of spiders, newts, and sore-throats, we took a shuddering survey of the damp, dingy walls, the pitiful decorations, the miserable *tout ensemble*, and congratulating ourselves on the developed taste of the nineteenth century, returned to the cheerful day as quickly as we could. We should have looked on all with a different and more intelligent eye had we known the feelings which had been excited—the class of faculties set to work—in the creation of this little gloomy solitude; how it had been glorified as so many of our works are by a sentiment in the outset, which struggled for expression, and must find its way into some, however inadequate, action. If we had known that fine ladies had left the stiff grandeur of their drawing-rooms, and had laid aside their costly silks to indulge their fancy here, and work out a little dream of a pure primitive, quiet life, as remote in all its circumstances as they could devise it from the one they daily lived, where poetry, friendship, and religion should hold a perennial sway; where it should be always spring; where goodness, simplicity, wisdom, and philosophy should be inspired with the air; where the rustic cross, the scallop shell, the sandals, the staff, and the maple bowl, which actually formed the furniture of a first-rate grotto, should all be realities and suit somebody, though probably the precise person to enjoy this contemplative elysium might never be exactly defined. But altogether it afforded an idea of repose in a *busy* practical life, and thus was a poem. We can only guess that the Duchess of Portland's and Mrs. Delany's grottoes would resemble in their general character those we have seen. They would be sure to be the best of their kind, for the Duchess had a fine spirit, and collected shells and stones regardless of cost from all parts of the world; and Mrs. Delany had really a fine taste, and was the undisputed head of all feminine works of fancy and invention of her time. It was one of her secrets of success, as we have said, that she never got quite beyond its tastes and aspirations; that she was always guided by its estimate of things, only setting these in their best and purest light. We are led to infer that she really was a very fair artist. She delighted to copy the works of great artists. Sir Joshua Reynolds warmly commended her copy of Correggio's Sigismunda, and her friends write with enthusiasm of all her performances, but she never doubted the fashions of her day even in their extremes of unreasonableness; and she who could expatiate on a Vandyke and a Raphael, and spend weeks and months reproducing them on her easel, writes quite nervously on hearing that her brother was following some adventurous spirits in wearing his own hair! 'You said not one word to me,' she

writes, 'about Bunny's wearing his own hair. I had a letter 'yesterday from Lady Carteret. She writes me word that he 'looks *very well* with his new-adorned pate. Tell me what 'you think? I *fancy* a wig became him better; what provoked 'him to cut *so bold a stroke?*' Happily for her she had an innate love of simple pleasures, and the customs of the time, even in the fashionable world, were, in many respects, in favour of them. Their hours admitted of being much out of doors, and of *al fresco* entertainments. There are continual allusions to meals out of doors, to expeditions with a Watteau touch of Arcadia about them. Thus, visiting, while in Ireland, Mr. Wesley, the grandfather of the Duke of Wellington, she writes:—

'Mr. Wesley (alias *Paris*) has provided every one of us with a walking staff whereon is fixed our Parnassus name. Mr. Usher is *Vulcan*, Young Nemmy, *Mars;* and Mr. Kit Don (the Revd.) is *Neptune*. Our staffs are white, and when we take our walks we make a most surprising appearance, somewhat like the sheriff's men at the assizes! Yesterday we walked four miles before dinner, and danced two hours in the evening.'—*Ibid.* Vol. i. p. 406.

The family of Wesley, by the way, seem to have been wonderful dancers. Mr. Wesley plays the fiddle, and dances with his children and guests at one and the same time, with something of the simple enjoyment Mr. Thackeray attributes to George the Third in his youth, who, he says, would dance country dances three or four hours together to the same tune. She entertains a friend at the home of her second marriage, and writes:—

'My garden is at present in the high glow of beauty, my cherries ripening, roses, jessamines, and pinks in full bloom, and the hay, partly spread, partly in cocks, complete the rural scene. We have discovered a new breakfasting place under the shade of the nut-trees impenetrable to the sun's rays, in the midst of a grove of elms, where we shall breakfast this morning: I have ordered cherries, strawberries, and nosegays to be laid on our breakfast table, and have appointed a harper to be here to play to us during our repast, who is to be hid among the trees. Mrs. Hamilton is to breakfast with us, and is to be cunningly led to this place *and surprised*.'—*Ibid.* p. 558.

Or she describes a water party; and London and a Thames wherry answer excellently for Venice and a gondola. The Lord Tyrconnell mentioned had lately been refused by Mrs. Pendarves on the ground of want of sense:—

'After drinking tea Lady Mary went away; Capel proposed going on the water; we accepted the offer, took up Mr. Wesley on our way, drove to Whitehall Stairs, took the boat we liked best, and rowed away very pleasantly —the water smooth, the sky serene, the company in good humour. Philomel was soon called upon to make use of her sweet pipe, which she did; a boat with two ladies and one gentleman was immediately attracted and pursued us. As soon as they were near enough to see their faces, who should we behold but the Duchess of Ancaster, an odd woman with her, and my Lord Tyrconnell! I was not a little diverted at the interview, but much more so when he

opened his wise mouth, and told Mrs. Donnellan her singing was "the finest water language he ever heard, nay, the finest language he had ever heard by land or by water;" and many more polite speeches we had. They were in an open boat, ours was covered; it would have diverted you to see how the wretch peeped to look at us, which was no easy matter. My companion's voice charmed them so much that they did not quit us till she had sung several songs. Capel asked the Duchess of Ancaster to sing; which she did very readily; at last they agreed to sing a duetto out of the Beggar's Opera, but such catterwalling never was heard, and we all laughed.'—*Ibid.* p. 276.

The Thames of the London in 1861 has altered since June, 1731, when these people sung so merrily on its pure and undisturbed waters, which they seem to have had pretty much to themselves. On another occasion she describes a country walk at Welbeck, which the Duchess of Portland had recently inherited. We are not a little impressed with the cortége necessary to explore the country at a couple of miles from the great house:—

'Last Wednesday (Sept. 1856) we took a walk to a place called Creswell Craggs with the Duchess and her fair flock. D. D. Mr. Smallwall, Lord Titchfield's tutor, and one of the Duke's stewards to show us the way, and two pioneers to level all before us. At least a dozen stiles were laid flat, paths cut through thickets and brambles and briars, and bridges made in swampy places; the length of the way computed at about two miles and a half. A resolution was taken on setting out not to delay the walk by *simpling*, so we only snatched at any curious grass or flower in our way and stuffed it in our black apron pockets to observe upon at our return round the tea table.'—*Ibid.* Vol. iii. p. 441.

This *simpling*—'culling of simples'—was an unscientific botany. Everything that was beautiful or curious in nature attracted their notice, though they seemed left very much to their own unassisted observations, and had none of those long Latin names, which modern science puts at our modern ladies' finger-ends, with which at once to dignify and to identify their discoveries. The Duchess writes:—

'I have looked all over my collection of moss and can't find any thing like yours. That which most resembles it is the *small flowering green stone moss* and *the beard of briar*, but the first is a deeper green and not scarlet, and the other is not near so beautiful as yours. I found to-day a very odd fly—the body black, the legs red, and the tail half an inch long; the whole fly rather larger than a gnat.'—Vol. i. p. 618.

There is something quite touching in this simple treatment of things, which learned men have now taught every lady to define 'with a clumsy name;' but the love for them tells more as a characteristic before classification gave facilities and zest to such pursuits, and brought them into fashion. We find Mrs. Pendarves wondering at the insensibility of mankind to the beauty of shells, for which she had a passion, which was ministered to by friends and strangers till she had specimens from all parts of the world. At its commencement she writes to her sister:—

'I have got a new madness. I am running wild after shells. This morning I have set my little collection of shells in my cabinet, and they look so beautiful that I must by some means enlarge my stock; the beauties of shells are as infinite as of flowers, and to consider how they are inhabited enlarges a field of wonder that leads one insensibly to the great Director and Author of these wonders. How surprising is it to observe the indifference, nay (more properly), the *stupidity*, of mankind, that seem to make no reflection as they live, are pleased with what they meet with because it has beautiful colours or an agreeable sound; there they stop, and receive but little more pleasure from them than a horse or a dog.'—Vol. i. p. 485.

It is a symptom of an unscientific age, and of an age, too, in which the canons of taste had as yet to be laid down, that this love for the pretty things of nature led to strange experiments of adapting them to domestic ornamentation. People did not care merely to look at them as specimens (very few do now), they must be made to do man a service, to minister, as it were, to his luxuries and whims. Thence resulted prodigious labours, of which we can only guess the effect. Not only were shells embedded in the walls of grottoes, but they are festooned into cornices for rooms and chapels—and positively painted over to one tint—and cemented round a frame work for chandeliers; in every instance exciting intense interest in the progress of the work; and, what is much more surprising, satisfying the artist in the result, and causing an enthusiasm amongst her friends. What is new and neatly executed has a temporary triumph with us all.

The manual industry of these ladies is something to wonder at, and elicits from the editress some very pointed contrasts between past and present fine ladies. The Duchess, besides her 'cave,' and her ivory and amber turnings, had twelve 'toilettes' in hand at one time, whatever these may be; besides the more modern interests of a *virtuoso*, in making a fine collection of pictures and curiosities; and the work executed and turned out of hand by Mrs. Delany surpasses our ideas of the credible. The real value of most of these labours must always have lain in their effect on the worker. We know that they assisted to keep mind and body in health, serenity, and vigour to an extraordinary age. It is a further testimony to her model character that all this business does not seem to have induced a fussy, bustling manner, to which notable women are subject. A charming, graceful, easy serenity is spoken to by her friends.

She herself owns to ranking a good manner, in her own sex at least, next to religion and pure morals, and perhaps *the* lesson to be learnt from this book is the value and importance of good manners. We feel that we have been to school. There is no doubt that (according to the approved phrase), we rise from its perusal with an added sense of the desirableness and pleasantness of being well mannered ourselves, and of all our friends being so gifted. We see a moral in a courteous and

gracious deportment, and have an insight into the education that forms it. It is a subject on which Mrs. Delany thought a good deal: she practised all she preached, and no doubt was herself an authority. It enters into her primary ideas of education.

'Next to inculcating right religious principles, the most material work is to make brothers and sisters *perfectly well bred towards one another*. I see many sad disagreements arise in families, merely from want of *good manners!*'—Vol. iii. 58.

'There is nothing I wish so much for Mary, *next* to right religious principles, as a *proper* knowledge of the polite world. It is the *only means* of keeping her safe from an immoderate love of its vanities and follies, and of giving her that sensible kind of reserve which great retirement converts either to awkward sheepishness, or occasions the *worst evil of the two, a forward pertness*.'—*Ibid.* p. 227.

'Mary (her niece), has had *uncommon* advantages at home for the improvement of what is *most* material, and a foundation is laid by her excellent, kind instructors, that will make her happy beyond this earthly tabernacle: but this is not all that is requisite, unless she is to turn hermit. There is *grace* and *manner*, which cannot be attained without conversing with a variety of well-bred people, which, well chosen, cannot efface what is certainly more necessary, but will give a polish, and by an agreeable recommendation, render all the good part more useful and acceptable to those she converses with.'—Vol. iii. p. 537.

'About Mary I *cannot* think it necessary to the accomplishment of a young lady that she should be *early* and *frequently* produced in public. I would rather see a little awkward bashfulness, than a daring, forward, genteelness. Good company, and good conversation, I should wish to have my niece introduced into, as soon as she can speak and understand; but for all public places, till *after fifteen* (except a play, or an oratorio), she should not know what they are, and then *very rarely*, and *only* with her mother or aunt.'—*Ibid.* p. 92.

She is gravely solicitous about Mary's dancing:—

'Dunoyer is now, I believe, the best dancing-master in London: his price is high, but he will give the Pauline a better air in a month, than a less skilful dancing-master would in three. I believe Lady Cooper has good interest with him, and that may make him take more pains.'—Vol. iii. 585.

She criticises her own manner in the tone of one who speculates on the subject, on occasion of giving her impressions of Irish society, in her first visit there, paid to restore her usual serenity, after the wound her spirits had received from 'Herminius'' behaviour. Dublin, it should be noted, was a much more courtly place while it had its parliament than it is now:—

'As for the generality of people I meet with here, they are much the same as in England—a mixture of good and bad; all that I have met with behave themselves very decently according to their rank; now and then an oddity breaks out, but none so extraordinary but that I can match it in England. There is a heartiness about them that is more like Cornwall than any I have known, and great sociableness. I apprehend, from that way of living, there must arise a good deal of tittle-tattle, but I have not heard much yet. Wherever I go I meet with great civilities. I don't take it as paid me on my own account, but that of those I am with, who are here highly regarded, and indeed, their

friendliness and kindness to me increases every day. They study to entertain me, and I have no uneasiness on their account, but that they may think I am not so cheerful as they would have me; but, as I grow older (she is thirty-one), though I feel as much warmth as ever, I have not got so lively a way of showing it. I attribute it a great deal to the fear I have always had of appearing too gay; a wrong notion. I am now convinced it hurts the temper. Our spirits ought to have their full career when our inclinations are innocent, and should not be checked, but where they would exceed the bounds of prudence.—Vol. i. 291.

She was fastidious in her judgment of others on this point. In speaking of the young Lady Mornington, mother of the Duke of Wellington, we read:—

'I believe Mrs. Hill has been very careful, in the common way, for the education of her daughters; they are in very good order, and civil. What I think L. M. may be wanting in, is what few people have attained at her age, who have not some real superiority of understanding, and a little experience of the manners of the world; nor could she learn from her mother that politeness of behaviour and address, which is not only *just* but *bright*. She is pretty, and excessively good-natured and happy in her present situation; but I own I think my godson required a wife that had more the punctilios of *good breeding*, as he is much wanting in them himself; and those things *should not* be wanting to men of rank and fortune. Indeed, I *carry it further*, and I think that nobody can do so much good in the world who is *not* well bred, as those that *are*. In truth, it is only a modern phrase (according to my notion of that virtue) for that "*charity*" emphatically expressed by St. Paul.'—Vol. iii. p. 546.

She is a warm admirer and friend of Richardson, and sheds torrents of tears over Clarissa; still, it is well known that the fine ladies of that time were forced to admit solecisms in the manners of these admired and cherished volumes. A certain Miss Mulso comes in for some of the blame. She writes:—

'D. M. commends Miss Mulso's letters, but she does not so well like the young woman; that is, she admires her sense and ingenuity, but thinks her only second-rate as to *politeness of manners*, and that Richardson's *high admiration* for her has made her take her for a model for his genteel characters, and that is the reason they are *not so* really polished as he thinks them to be.'—*Ibid.* iii. p. 60.

'Genteel' then was a choice and expressive word, far from the disgrace into which it is now fallen. Women might pass very well; they might have rank and the habits of society, but not deserve to be called genteel. The writer pronounces of the belles of Bath, that they are very 'ungenteel;' and Lady Betty Hastings was modest and civil in her manner, but not 'genteel.' Her strong notions of the duty of keeping up society gives the question of manners a moral aspect:—

'Three days together spent abroad is being a downright rake, but the sobriety of my own dwelling is much pleasanter to me than all the flirtations of the world, though the society of it I will always keep up *to the best of my power*, as it is a duty incumbent on us to live sociably; and it is necessary to keep up good humour and benevolence in ourselves, or the qualities of the heart contract

and grow useless, as our limbs would do without any proper exercise.—Vol. ii. p. 418.

She has a great respect for rules. 'No ceremony,' she says of a friend, 'subsists between us—

'Though ceremony is proper, to keep those at a distance that otherwise might be troublesome.'

And in speaking of her dear friend, Letitia Bushe, whose perfection as a companion she very happily defines, saying, 'She 'will be a great loss to me; she is one of the few who is per-'fectly qualified for an agreeable companion in a domestic way; 'her sweetness of temper makes her give into all one's ways, as 'if she chose to do whatever is proposed;'—she writes, after parting with her, when her friendship was most needed:—

'My ingenious and agreeable companion, Mrs. Bushe, was obliged to return to Lady Austin, and I would not let her run the risk, by staying any longer, of disobliging her; it is not *honourable* to *monopolize*.'—Vol. ii. p. 193.

And of all graceful attentions she says,—while hinting that, as a housekeeper, she could have dispensed with a dinner-party Dr. Delany (or D.D. as he is always called), arranged on her birthday:—

'Though I have too much regard for *les petits soins* of those I love not to value every mark of affection: but if people only keep upon the *great road of loving*, and neglect the little paths of friendship, many delicate pleasures are lost.'—Vol. iii. p. 120.

A certain Lady Bell Monck seems to have greatly exercised the forbearance of this polite circle by her constant deviations from their high standard. Her name never occurs without some allusion to them: but we have a perfect confidence that this sensitiveness was never allowed to betray itself. This was the age, especially, for good manners and politeness to have their martyrs. Lady Bell and her husband are staying at Bulstrode, and spoiling a long-planned visit.

'L. B. M. is a sad check upon our pleasures; they have named three different days for going away, and yet they are here, and I fear will be, as long as we stay in the country, which is truly a mortification. The Duchess behaves herself in the most obliging and proper manner that can be towards her, but it is much thrown away; however, it becomes her to do so, though *her pearls* are disregarded.'—Vol. ii. p. 523.

The restraints of good-breeding a hundred and more years ago were, we suspect, of a more stringent character than modern habits would tolerate. They were a real discipline of which we think we perceive the fruits in more important points. These volumes, no doubt, introduce us to most favourable examples of the rank and fashion of the eighteenth century. Mrs. Delany and her friends were complimented on all hands as models for their sex's imitation and examples of virtue and piety; but theirs was essen-

tially the religion of the day, and therefore tells of more than the habits of mind of one circle; and what strikes us in them, is a consistent resignation to the orderings of Providence, such as we miss in even the good people of our own time. They accepted the inevitable without grumblings or repinings. Modern inventions have cleared away so many hindrances, that we seem the more impatient of those that remain. We rail at every passing inconvenience, at every delay or stoppage in the social machinery, and, above all, at the one power which we cannot master, which we must submit to, whose caprices and severities are utterly beyond our control. How many Christians are practical atheists with regard to the weather! How many have contracted a habit of what we might call decent blasphemy against rain and cold, fog and damp, as though Providence had no concern with them—as though the check they offer to our plans and pleasures were the design of the evil principle! As far as we can judge, these things were better borne a century ago. The inconveniences of travelling, for instance, were enormous. It is a matter of surprise and congratulation to Mrs. Delany, that the high-road from London to Dublin was so good that they did not once come to a dead stand, so as to have to alight from the coach. After parting from her sister at Gloucester, on her return to London, she writes, in 1728:—

'I believe you have some curiosity to know how I was entertained during my journey. At the end of the town some part of the coach broke, and we were obliged to get out, and took shelter at an alehouse: in half an hour we jogged on, and about an hour after that, flop we went into a slough, not overturned, but stuck. Well, out we were hauled again, and the coach with much difficulty was heaved out. We then once more set forward, and came to our journey's end without any other accident or fright, and met with no waters worth getting out of the coach for.'—Vol. i. p. 176.

It always took her three days to get from London to Gloucester, and she begs her sister not to ride to meet her on account of the intolerable dirt. From Oxford she writes:—

'We got to Euston about one: were delayed half an hour on the road, by the car *wheels breaking;* no overturn, but Smith was obliged to be hoisted up behind Bennet without any pillion, and James came wabbling on with the broken equipage, his *fribbleship* much ruffled. I feasted at Euston on your good provisions, but not very hungry; we staid about two hours. About three miles from Oxford, we had like to have lost one of our *fore-wheels*, but, fortunately saw our danger before any bad accident. The coachman very soon repaired the loss, and we arrived at Oxford about six.'—Vol. ii. p. 505.

She mentions it as a point of superiority in Ireland—

'A comfortable circumstance belonging to this country is, that the roads are so good, and free from robbers, that we may drive safely any hour of the night.'—Vol. ii. p. 686.

The passage to Dublin involved infinite delays and trials of patience, such as no modern temper could stand. To be at the

water-side was nothing. Days had to be passed with no other employment than watching and waiting for the 'yacht' and for the wind, and waiting with a long voyage, as it often proved to be, before them. But, supplied with a due amount of needlework and patience, the time passes serenely,—the Dean, perhaps, deserving the greater praise, for he has the patience without the needlework,—and there is never a murmur; it is taken hardly as a trial, simply as an event. No grumblings even about sea-sickness, which is now and then touched upon as an inevitable accompaniment of a ship, without one word of vituperative description. All the eccentricities of the post are borne with equal philosophy. From Dublin she writes to her sister in England:—

'Your last letter was dated 27th January, and came to me in seven days. Could our letters always make as swift a passage, it would be charming.'—Vol. ii. p. 421.

Letters were often a month on the way. Nor is it only this class of inconveniences that are borne with serenity. The same spirit of quiet gentle pious endurance supports our heroine in all the delays of a painful law-suit which hangs over D.D. for years. She accepts suspense as the one trial of a happy lot, and strikes the balance in her own favour when things look their worst. London workmen, it is true, sometimes threaten to exhaust her patience, and once, she says, that if it were not that her friend was with her, she should be downright cross; but this exception only proves the rule. We are equally struck with the conduct of all concerned, when sickness or lesser ailments invade their circle. Mrs. Delany shows it in the prompt unmurmuring rearrangement of all her plans, when those belonging to her, either nearly or remotely, fall ill. Nothing is ever called provoking or ill-timed; no disappointment is ever expressed. But we are particularly edified by the deportment of the Duchess of Portland and her family, when small-pox breaks out at Bulstrode. We have just been entertained with a pretty scene of the eldest daughter's first presentation:—

'Our Duchess and Lady Betty came to town on Thursday, and we have been very full of business, in settling the jewels and clothes for the Birthday. The Duchess of Portland's is white and silver ground, flowered with gold and silver, and a stomacher of white satin, covered with her fine *coloured* jewels, and *all* her diamonds. Lady Betty is to have a very fine sprig of pearls, diamonds, and turquoises, for her hair, by way of pompoune, loops and stars of diamonds between, on blue satin, for her stomacher; her clothes white and silver, mosaic ground, flowered with silver, intermixed with a little blue. She *rehearsed* her clothes and jewels yesterday, and practised dancing with her train. She looks mighty well, and is a very genteel figure.' . . .

And afterwards she reports of the scene:—

'I don't believe there was a more engaging figure than Lady Betty. She looked so modest, so composed, and, though glittering with diamonds, showed

no sort of consciousness of any superior finery. . . .Lord Stormont, nephew to Mr. Murray, danced with Lady Betty. Never was such heat and crowding; but *she* says it "*was delightful for all that:*" she has the spirits one would wish a young thing to have, *great enjoyment* of the diversions allowed her, and no manner of regret when they are not thought proper for her.'—Vol. iii. p. 303.

Within a few weeks, one of the sons is taken ill. The Duchess, alway ready with her recipes, prescribes for him, and sends for the doctor, who pronounces it small-pox of a middling sort, neither the best nor the worst.

'*Dec.* 25.—The Duchess's spirits are more composed; her good sense and sweetness of temper make her exert and do all she can to keep up her spirits: It is a vast satisfaction to me that I am with her at this time, and so I am sure it is to you. She has given the young ladies *their choice*, to stay in the house or go to Whitehall; and they have so much fortitude that all *begged to stay*, and say they shall be miserable to leave her. I cannot help being anxious, though I trust in God He will protect them, and He only can reward such filial tenderness. . . .

'1*st Jan.*—Thank God, Lord Edward is quite out of danger of his late distemper. He has had a better sort than at first apprehended; it turned before the ninth day: he is the patientest little creature I ever saw. The young ladies still hold up most heroically; they have been taught to depend on Providence, and they credit their good teachers. The Duchess says it would be unpardonable ingratitude in her not to be most cheerfully resigned to God's will, who has been so gracious and merciful in the recovery of her son. It will be very extraordinary if the young ladies escape the infection. . . All the family were at Church, and received the Sacrament last Sunday. Dr. Markham read prayers, and the Dean officiated at the Communion table. . . Dr. Markham has been here ever since Monday was se'nnight. He is master of Westminster School; he is reckoned a very agreeable man; the Duchess and I think him dull, but he seems composed and steady, which may become his station more than vivacity. . .

'15*th Jan.*—Last Monday, at dinner, Lady Margaret Bentinck was taken ill: everybody imagined all infection over. Yesterday morning she complained of giddiness in her head, and great pain in her back. The doctor was instantly sent for from Windsor, but the apothecary, who was in the house, felt her pulse, saying it was absolutely necessary to *bleed her* without staying for the doctor. She was let blood. She says, "She is very glad," when she can speak, that she "has got the small pox." Her sisters are determined *not to leave her*, unless the Duchess forbids them, but she is silent on that point, so that, in all probability, here will be the same succession as was in your family. . . Lord Edward is quite well again, and expresses joy that his "dear Peggy" has got the small-pox.

'17*th Jan.*—The small-pox has come out very favourably with Lady Margaret. Lady Betty was taken in the night of Tuesday. No bad symptoms appear. . . We are in daily expectation of Lady Harriet. She continues well, but will not quit her sister's room all day. The Duchess loves Babess extremely, and is always glad of her company; but as I can stay with her she will have nobody else, for she finds she must keep herself very quiet, and that the least hurry overcomes her. . .

'20*th Jan.*—Lady Betty rested very well last night (natural rest). Lady Margaret, I fear, has not a very good kind; I don't believe it will turn before the eleventh or twelfth day. She bears it with great composure, but her throat is very sore, and her eyes closed up. The Duchess bears up as well as she can, but her anxious state you can much easier imagine than most people.

Dear Lady Harriet still holds out, but certainly, if she is ever to have it, can hardly now escape. She is (or at least appears to be) in very good spirits, and prepared to receive it whenever it comes. The poor Duchess looks every moment with affectionate examining eyes for some alteration in her.'

There is allusion to the Duke, who is too anxious himself to be much support to his wife. At length, lady Harriet is taken, and anticipates the doctor's too ready lancet, by a violent bleeding at the nose.

'31*st Jan.*—I hope the worst is over with Lady Harriet. She is indeed a sweet creature; so patient under her pains; so cheerful, and so thankful for the least amendment. I always thought the Duchess blest in her children, but I did not know their full worth (nor, I may say, hers), till this trial. . . . Dear Lady Harriet goes on as well as can be expected, considering she has not a good sort. She has vast resolution in bearing her present miserable condition, for surely there cannot be anything more terrible to bear while it lasts! Between whiles she tries to make comical jokes upon her own figure, and keeps up everybody's spirits by her good humour. Lady Betty is fair almost as ever; her eyes as sparkling, and in charming spirits. She has not known the danger her darling sister has been in. Lady Margaret comes on slowly, and her spirits are but indifferent at best. . .

'*Feb. 5th.*—Lovely Lady Harriet is in a fair way of recovery, *which I could not say till now.* The Duchess is better: I was under great apprehensions for her a few days ago; she had all the symptoms of a fever, but they are gone off. . . As to their fair faces, I fear Lady Margaret will suffer a little, and Lady Harriet a great deal; but we are at present so glad to have her alive that we are not yet mortified about it. The Duchess has ordered rotten apples to be distilled, and is much obliged to you for your kind attention.'—Vol. iii. p. 313.

We have thought it not amiss to give this simple history of the visitation of a scourge, which was felt or feared in every household within the memory of some amongst us. The young ladies of our own time could hardly pass with more credit through such an ordeal, or do greater justice to their training. Indeed, it is a picture creditable to that period in every respect but its medicine; and the medical ideas and practices, which transpire in these volumes, do more than excite our contempt for the doctors of that day—they excite a suspicion of all doctoring whatever. To see a whole generation acquiesce as they did in the notion of 'blood-letting,' as the cure for all distempers, makes us mistrust our own judgment as well as theirs. Every day may have its favourite fallacy, and be the victim of some dangerous delusion. These letters show us how Mrs. Delany's beloved sister, Mrs. D'Ewes, was slowly (not so very slowly either) bled to death by her doctors. But for their interposition, there is no doubt that the correspondence would have extended through three more volumes of equal length with the present. The more the poor lady languished, the more necessary was it thought to bleed her. She became giddy, no doubt from loss of blood, but the symptom was interpreted into the need of more constant bleedings than

ever. All the doctors agreed in this, and all the friends and relations, Mrs. Delany amongst them, believed in the doctors. If she has a moment's misgiving, as where her brother reports:—

'I had a letter from him yesterday; he tells me you have let blood whilst he was with you, and that your blood was very good. Do you think it was of any service to you? *I fear not*, as you had a giddy fit or two after it.'

She returns to her allegiance in a few days, after consulting with her own doctor, and in the last letter she ever writes to her sister gives his opinion:—

'He is very earnest for your being *often blooded*, but never to lose more than four ounces at a time. He lays great stress upon it.'—Vol. iii. p. 626.

There is a case of a cousin who had some affection of the chest, for which she was bled, till she exhibited an alarming picture of attenuation, and who broke in upon various ceremonies by different summonses to her supposed death-bed, who yet lived to a good old age. Indeed, we must assume, that there was a stamina in these good ladies which the women of our time are without. Their active habits, their brisk housekeeping, their daily visits to kitchen and larder—'apple-chamber and cheese-room'—their persevering energetic dancing far into middle life, were strong counter influences, and carried them on, in spite of the doctors, to a good old age, and in spite, too, of domestic quackery, for all prescriptions are not as innocent as 'rotten apple-water, snails, and spiders,' or a morsel of stale bread taken before breakfast, from which so much is hoped. For example, Mrs. Delany somewhere prescribes for her little nephew a decoction of quicksilver, to be taken at all meals, with an utter ignorance of the hidden powers of that metal—to say nothing of chalk and tar-water, which was the fashionable panacea of the day.

We cannot study the familiar history of this time without observing what an important and recognised place match-making held in the class of feminine occupations. The term is now one of reproach. No woman likes to be called a match-maker; but Mrs. Delany, and all her most respected acquaintance, would have failed in their ideas of duty towards their friends, and their friends' children, if they had not busied themselves in their establishment in life. It was evidently part of the office of a godmother or *gossip*, as is gravely termed, to plan a good and suitable match for her charge. Mrs. Delany had far more sentiment on the question of marriage than most of those she lived with. She realized and acted upon the truth, that there must be union of feeling and moral worth to constitute happiness in this relation. We know that, in our time, it would be something not absolutely common-place for a woman of fashion to

act on the principles here expressed to her sister, on occasion of an offer she had received:—

'I think he has a great deal of merit, and I protest solemnly I am extremely sorry to give him any pain; and had I any inclination to marry, and a fortune double what I have, I would prefer him to any man I know; but to let you see *seriously* that *money without worth* cannot tempt me, I have refused my Lord Tirconnell. Lady Carteret asked me, the other day, if I would give her leave to proceed in it; that she thought I should be blameworthy to refuse so vast a fortune, a title, and a good-natured man. All that, I told her, was no temptation to me; he had the character, very justly, of being silly, and I would not tie myself to such a companion for an empire. She said I *was in the wrong.*'—Vol. i. p. 274.

We find her, too, lamenting on the necessity that existed of women marrying for the sake of a home; but in the main she recognised it as a necessity, and could never see a marriageable young woman without wishing her well settled, nor help regarding matrimony as a cure for most evils. 'Poor Maria Barber is 'a melancholy, drooping young woman,' she writes, 'and I wish 'a prospect of her being well settled, but I hear of none.' She busied herself with all her skill to bring about a match between young Lord Weymouth, who was taking to dissipated courses, and Miss Carteret, and congratulates herself much on her success, though under circumstances which would hardly, in our eyes, have warranted it, and which savours much more of the days of Richardson than of Miss Yonge and Miss Sewell; as does the sentiment gravely uttered on occasion of her god-daughter, 'Sally Chapene's,' difficulties in preferring the lover who did *not* come forward:—

'I think it very hard that a young woman should be kept in an uncertain state, and not at liberty to accept the addresses of another man, because a person she has a high value for is so mysterious in his behaviour, that she cannot tell what his designs are.'—Vol. iii. p. 394.

But all the instances to the point would inconveniently swell our pages; we will content ourselves with one specimen example, where the process is given in detail, in its most dignified form and characteristic words. Are our Bishops ever 'sent for' on such errands?—

'I have been for some time in an odd situation about an affair that I have had in my head and at my heart. Our dear, worthy Violet's circumstances are such, that if it were now possible to settle her well it would be doing a good action, and I have had a hint given me that Mr. G——n, near Windsor, has thoughts of marrying, but is afraid of the fine ladies, and that it was not impracticable if a judicious friend could be met with, to have her character given him, that such a union might be compassed. I thought of the Bishop of Gloucester, who is the most intimate friend the gentleman has. I sent for him, told him frankly my thoughts, and begged his friendship and assistance, both which he promised me when an opportunity offered; but he feared the gentleman wanted *some money*, as the Earl had not settled the fortune, though the

title would come to him; but he approved of my scheme, and said he would do all he could, for he thought they were worthy of each other, and *he* bears as good a character as *she* does. This was three weeks ago, and I have not heard one word.'—Vol i. p. 269.

A fortnight later, the Bishop reports progress:—

'The Bishop of Gloucester has just been with me; he has had an opportunity of talking to Mr. G. He asked him if he had ever had such a query proposed to him, that her fortune was *so and so*, and her character a most extraordinary one from everybody. The gentleman agreed she had an excellent character, said she never had been mentioned to him, and made no objection, but gave no encouragement for the Bishop to say more.'—Vol. ii. p. 276.

A few weeks further on, the negotiation comes to a stop:—

'The Bishop of Gloucester was with me three days ago, but with no good news; he has twice mentioned what was desired, but nothing was said that could be interpreted to her advantage. The Bishop wishes there may be interviews this summer, which perhaps (as he is unengaged) may bring about some resolution.'—*Ibid.* p. 284.

There the affair ends, but not the friendly zeal for cousin Violet, who evidently weighs on her mind; for, two years later, we find another suggestion:—

'I don't think it likely Lord North should marry Lady W., but don't wonder, where there is such an intimacy, there should be such a report. If he does marry again (as I think it very likely he should), I don't know anyone so fitted to make him and his family happy as our Violet. Her *discretion and goodness of temper* would make her a jewel in a family so mixed as they are. . . . . But it is to be feared he will be taken by some blooming thing that will marry him for his fortune and to make a show,' &c.—Vol. ii. p. 393.

There is evidently no end to the judicious arrangements that a sensible woman might make for her friends; and though cousin Violet happens not to be an example in point of success, we are not at all sure that the decline of matrimony, so feelingly regretted in our day, and the vast increase in the community of old maids, which calls for so many remarks from the press, is not to be attributed in a good measure to a radical change in the system of making marriages. A hundred years ago, all the matrons were engaged in disinterested plans for their female friends. Merit, however modest and retiring, was not allowed to pass unnoticed; attention was called to it. Men were not permitted to remain widowers or bachelors without being reminded of the duty they owed to society and to female worth. And, on the other hand, ladies were advised to keep fancy and inclination under control: it was taken for granted on all sides, that a vast number of men were equally eligible, provided all could offer the same easy circumstances. We read of an infinite number of matches in these volumes, but of very few begun and carried through by the parties themselves simply because they loved each other. Such a proceeding would have been regarded with

suspicion, as savouring of wilfulness or other impropriety. People first determined to marry, and then cast about for a proper object. Thus, Dr. Delany, having lost his first wife two years, set himself to consider who should succeed that lady in his affections. Long before, he had met Mrs. Pendarves in Dublin, and all who enjoyed her society thought her charming. His choice fell upon her, and a very cool choice we must think it to have been in an Irish D.D. of fifty-eight, and looking older. When his decision was made, his plan was not first to renew his acquaintance with the lady whom he had not seen for ten years, but to make his offer at once, and thus announce his approach. And a very fair straightforward letter it is, though much too long for our space. It induced Mrs. Pendarves, now forty-three years of age, to consult her mother and sister, with the full purpose, no doubt, of deciding for herself. She knew him to be a man of worth and of learning, and with such a reputation for wit as the chosen friend of Dean Swift must possess. She weighed all the circumstances, saw that his character, fortune, and position—though the last not what her friends might have expected for her—were such as would conduce to her happiness, and in a very short time closed with his offer. His proposal was made April, 1743, and the wedding took place the 9th of June of the same year. Nothing could have answered better, and there can be no happier picture of married life in middle age. It is marked by a uniformity of tastes, which is seldom seen where people have grown from youth into one another's habits, and such sweetness of temper on each side as would have made them happy, even if such sympathy had been wanting. Nor was Ireland at all such a banishment for a woman of fashion, as it would now be regarded. She was subject to no violent change, either of society or social habits. She was of a nature to be always young, and we are led to believe her face, figure, and habits, to have all favoured the agreeable deception. The happy couple mutually befriended one another: her interest soon got him the deanery of Down, and she tried philosophically and decorously for a bishopric. But this further promotion, though seemingly within reach, never came. Their pretensions never clashed. She was always the loving obedient wife, reverencing his office, implicitly deferring to his opinions, and proud of his official and parochial labours when she has such to record; while he looked up to her with at least equal respect; gloried in her accomplishments, encouraged all her pursuits, devoted himself to her happiness, sanctioned her liberal and elegant hospitality, and was delighted to see her at the head of the best society Ireland afforded, always sought after and courted, always sensible, genial, and gracious. He was evi-

dently a most creditable specimen of a Church dignitary, literary, clerical, devout, and orthodox; but his duties were not so arduous as to interfere with long absences, not only from Down, but from Ireland altogether, when he accompanied his wife in her triennial visits to her friends in England.

It was a marriage which for itself and for the time in which it was contracted eminently suited her. She was one of the people made for friendship rather than more absorbing emotions. She had a reserve and self-reliance, which led her to choose the confidence and companionship of her own sex, and to repose on the calmer domestic affections, the love of family and home; such influences as offered no disturbing forces to the natural development of her own nature. These volumes show us a temper perhaps a good deal rarer than we would at first sight suppose, one which we are apt to assume for ourselves, as a matter of course—we mean the affectionate temper;—that is, really a nature in which there is such a harmony of engaging qualities, of warmth, tenderness, kindness, indulgence, unselfishness, fidelity, and discretion, as may lead to the formation of many real attachments, and constancy in them. Most people can be affectionate to those immediately about them and belonging to them, as parts of themselves; or they can be affectionate so long as there is an identity of interests or frequency of intercourse; but it belongs to few to go on loving with unwavering regard—in spite of changes of place and fortune, and inevitable changes of character (we speak of change, not deterioration)—the same people throughout a life; to hold by the friends of youth to old age. We all must admit that it implies habitual forbearance, toleration, and justice, a constant sense of others' claims and submission of our own, a freedom from jealousy, and a general right balance of mind, to maintain friendships unimpaired through the innumerable trials and vicissitudes to which they are exposed, as it needs expansiveness and warmth of heart to form them. It is a subject which might be pursued to great length: we consider Mrs. Delany an example of the virtue, though the circumstances of her day befriended this natural capability.

In her day a large number of separating causes did not exist which affect us now. The grades of society were more fixed, opinion in religion and politics was more fixed, people were more tolerant, they more needed each other's society, and had ways of entertaining themselves which kept them clear of intellectual excitement. It is curious, in this vast mass of correspondence, how few sore subjects, or disputed points, or differences of opinion, are touched upon. And when they occur it is no personal matter, but some case in which the warmth and gene-

rosity of her friendship leads her from the usual calm charity of judgment. Minds now-a-days, separated by circumstances, are apt to drift from one another in spite of themselves; there are so many questions on which friends may split, such rapid transitions, so many opportunities for divergence; such a feverish activity of thought circulates about us, of which there is little indication in these volumes. We infer that an intellectual age, in which people are always probing into the depths of their own and other people's minds, does not encourage habits of friendly, sociable, affectionate constancy. But that, even in Mrs. Delany's day, the temper we have attributed to her needed guidance and self-restraint is evident, in the following early counsel to her sister:—

'I am of your opinion, that nothing requires more penetration than to be able to find out other people's characters; too candid, or too severe a way of judging, is apt to mislead one, though the first occasions less mischief than the latter. *That talent* seems to me as much a genius as music, or poetry, &c.: it may possibly *be acquired* by much experience and observation, but not often. I think one ought to be very cautious in declaring one's opinion either to the prejudice or advantage of anyone; for if you commended upon a slight acquaintance, and they afterwards prove unworthy of it, one's judgment will certainly be called in question. I need not give you any caution against censure, for no one is less apt to run into it; but I find, upon the whole, that a proper silence gives one more the *character* of wisdom than speaking one's sentiments too openly, though ever so well expressed.'—Vol. i. p. 460.

She had not only caution but this knowledge of character, and an instinct of perceiving who and what she liked; for we find her pronouncing, for once on a slight acquaintance, a certain Mrs. Hamilton, 'as one that I should always feel happy to have within my reach,' who, twenty years after, when she was within reach, exactly fulfilled her expectation, was a much valued neighbour, with whom she held constant delightful intercourse. To account in some degree for this felicity, it must be observed that she had an absolute accordance with her own age; she was visited by no obstinate questionings; she served her friends in the approved way, as well as with zeal. And after all, zeal does a great deal more, and is a much firmer ally when it goes with the times than against them. These good ladies, for instance, had none of them any scruples about places and sinecures. Their notions of politics are circumscribed; they value statesmen as they can get from them pensions and appointments for their friends. If they fail in finding a husband for some fair cousin, they try to make her a maid of honour, or to get her a pension; and when success attends these efforts, the congratulation and applause are without a suspicion or a doubt of the intrinsic merit of the transaction. As for example:—

'I have a letter from my brother, with the good news of the Duchess of

Portland having obtained a pension of 200*l.* for Babess; she struggled hard for 300*l.*, but it is well this is obtained. She has been a zealous and kind friend, and has acted in this affair as few in her station have inclination to do, or if they have will not give up their time and thoughts enough to bring it about.'—Vol. iii. p. 21.

There is not a pretence that this 'Babess' has any other claim on her country than being a single lady of high birth and small means. We are not, however, censuring either the action or the applause bestowed upon it; these ladies accepted the ideas of their time, and did the best for their friends with them.

Our space will not allow us to touch upon much that is curious and interesting. Accidental scattered notices of persons and customs attract us as we turn over the pages which we must pass by. There is constant mention of Handel, who was on terms of friendship with her brother Mr. Granville, and patronised by her family. She was an enthusiast for his music, and attends every opera and oratorio, but we learn nothing new about the man. She knew Hogarth and the leading artists of the day, but only names occur. She corresponded with Swift, with whom she became acquainted only a short time before his loss of reason. His letters convey a favourable impression as far as they go; his compliments are not so unmeaning as the compliments of the time generally are, and there is too much spirit, point, and style in all that he writes for him ever to degenerate into that wonderful form of composition, the complimentary letter of the eighteenth century, which is a thing *sui generis*. We have in these volumes innumerable examples of them from all sorts of people, but not one conveys any idea beyond a certain cloudy incense of homage, not one differs from another so far as to be distinguishable, not one contains a fact or a statement—anything so definite as either would be felt to be an impertinence. It is eating in a dream, groping in the dark, fume, flourish, and emptiness. Fortunately, it is only a state dress, kept for state occasions. Mrs. Delany assumes it now and then, when her style is nearly as pompous, turgid, and destitute of interest as Dr. Young's of the 'Night Thoughts' himself, and we might almost add, John Wesley, from the one letter given of his, which is so vague and wordy, that it is hard to believe it was from the man who was so soon to rouse his generation. Her ordinary style is more modern than her age, and singularly free from affectation, telling what she wants to say in few words and in the simplest manner. It was regarded as a model and wonder of grammatical propriety and elegance in her own time, when many women of fashion could hardly spell, and when Swift told her he could remember fine court ladies writing to him with the 'scrawl and

the spelling of a Wapping wench.' It is often only by the obsolete use of a few words that we are reminded of the more than century that has elapsed since the pen wrote them. One of the most frequent of these, the word *clever*, which is uniformly applied to nimbleness of *limb*, not of wit. 'Six couple of as *clever* dancers as ever eye beheld.' 'All the *clever* men (as partners) had gone to Newmarket.' Also the superlatives of every age will change. '*Mightily*,' was a word in constant use, and '*pure*,' as we use '*fine*,' for excessive. 'I will show her,' says pretty Lady Harriet, after her small-pox, 'a *pure* spotted face.' Let us further observe on an absolute freedom from slang and cant terms; such would no doubt have been impossible vulgarisms from the pen or the lips of a correct fine lady. We cannot help indulging a passing regret that they are not *as* impossible in the ladies of our own day.

But it is high time to turn to Mrs. Piozzi. The date of Mrs. Delany's last letters are 1761, within four years of the period when Mrs. Thrale took her place amongst the noted women of the time, through her intimacy with Dr. Johnson. The editor somewhere gives it as his opinion, that 'in some respects, Johnson's character gains by these fresh disclosures; in others, it certainly 'loses.' Here we entirely differ from him. Everything trustworthy in these volumes is entirely characteristic of Johnson, and shows him in no new light. A trait or two more or less of bearishness, or even of self-indulgence, can make no material difference in our thoughts of him, for we have always respected and admired him in spite of bearishness and other ungracious drawbacks. However, we cannot help speculating on every fresh exhibition of this most singular and interesting character, doomed, it would seem, because the uncouthness of its defects made it especially unfit for close scrutiny, to the protracted survey of posterity. We are never allowed in his case to know the mind without the man—that lumbering body, those wild gestures, those insufferable habits, are protruded upon us with endless persistence. In a certain sense they only add to his *prestige*. What must that mind have been which reigned and ruled in spite of *every* point of figure and manner being against him!

Amongst the many marvels of Dr. Johnson, not the least is the tolerance that was shown to his bearishness, to the rudeness, not to say brutality, of his manners—sometimes wholly unprovoked. No person, as we have said, would be the better for enduring these wounds to self-respect; but we suspect that Dr. Johnson was in the main unconscious of his own misdeeds. He wrote well on the subject of manners. We find in the 'Rambler' the reflection, curiously applicable to himself, that 'wisdom and

'virtue are by no means sufficient without the fundamental 'laws of good-breeding, to secure freedom from degenerating 'into rudeness, or self-esteem from swelling into insolence; a 'thousand incivilities may be committed, and a thousand offices 'neglected, without any remorse of conscience, or reproach 'from reason;' but the context does not at all give the idea that he had himself in his eye. Because he was possessed of extraordinary powers of mind, it is virtually assumed that he must be endowed with adequate control over these powers, and that his faults were more blameable because of his great intellectual superiority. But, in fact, there is nothing more disproportioned and unequal than men of genius—nothing more unmanageable by the possessors than force. Human beings do not rightly know what to do with extra powers. It is god-like to have a giant's strength, but it is tyrannous to use it like a giant. In fact, the giant can hardly help himself; he does not know the weight of his hand or the force of his blows. We believe he was constantly ignorant how his sayings told. Borne on by the excitement and stimulus of society, his whole mind was concentrated on talking well, a state directly opposed to sympathy. He was intent on wielding his engine with effect, to the exclusion of any thought where it fell. It was a public performance. With Boswell's miraculous memory taking notes at his elbow, he had generations for his hearers. It was necessary he should do well; he was pledged to show his best; he must come off victorious. Thus urged, he might expect even his opponent to see only the justice, the truth, or the simple intellect his brain was charged with. People's feelings had no better chance to be considered in this state of mind, than was their taste and sense of propriety, who had to witness his dreadful feeding time; when, absorbed by the food on his plate, he gave way to the passion of hunger. In each case he was so intent on what he was about that what people would *think* never entered his head. When such ideas did make their way, he could be sensitive. He objected to being drawn in a way to betray his short-sightedness. Sir Joshua might paint himself with his ear-trumpet if he pleased, but he, Johnson, would not go down to posterity as 'Blinking Sam.' He would no more have wished to go down to posterity as 'Bullying Sam' or 'Gobbling Sam' could he have *seen* the figure he made at dinner, or while demolishing some luckless opponent, and so have realized the danger. All persons gifted or afflicted with strength of expression are liable to the same error in degree. Strength is to them truth, which they expect every one to see and acknowledge. It carries them for the time right over all considerations of tenderness, not at all necessarily for insensibility, but that they are possessed by an

idea—that prolific source of so much unconscious cruelty. We have little doubt that Johnson often expected his victims to be gratified by his treatment of them, for he felt he was saying a good thing, of which they were the object. And Boswell's receptions of such favours might well strengthen him in the persuasion. Johnson's life in society was unparalleled as a trial; biography or experience gives us nothing to equal it. Most great talkers have a hint now and then in the weariness of their hearers. People tired of Coleridge's monologues, they ran away from Madame de Stael, and Macaulay's *flashes of silence* were visibly welcome; but Johnson conversed: men's minds quickened with him, and they never tired of hearing him—except it be Goldsmith, who could not stand his entire obscuration. In all books about Johnson, an immense deal of time is spent in reconciling what is irreconcilable; as if all talkers—brilliant, versatile, and speculative, as a good talker must be—did not contradict themselves. His love of paradox and contradiction produces endless discrepancies, which are conned over, disputed, gravely discussed. We work questions in our brain; there we own two sides, and conflicting arguments. Is the flowing eloquent talker likely to give only his mature conclusions, and to be always on his guard against the shadow of an inconsistency? Silent people may suppress all but the convictions arrived at; but nothing would surprise us more than a record of eager and abundant talk, clear of inconsistencies; it would create a suspicion of suppression or want of genuineness, as failing in the constant accompaniment of an active working intelligence, and seething brain. How many do we all know—honest men, too—who may be made to say seeming opposites within the hour? There is something to be said for every view; every full, ready, discursive mind sees all sides, and, except under restraint, or giving only his conclusions with his pen, is apt to talk on both sides. The man, for example, who has written well on one side, is in the very position to talk on the other. He is irritated by the dull way in which others echo his view; justice is not done to his opponents; he finds himself misunderstood; viewed as they would view him he is one-sided, uncandid, unfair; he turns round upon his partisans, and shows them how much may be said where they see not a point to stand on, and sends them off discomfited. Moreover, persons who pique themselves on accuracy of thought and expression cannot tolerate the loose talking of others; their comments are a running correction of other men's inaccuracies: they must set things straight as they go along, though the effect on their hearers be disappointment and perplexity.

We know that Dr. Johnson was so far from sharing the views

of his friends on the question of his manners, that he piqued himself on his knowledge of good breeding. He had excellent theories, as we have seen, on the subject, and was conscious of frequent efforts to put them in practice. Speaking of Dr. Barnard, Provost of Eton, lately dead, and eulogising his good qualities, he added, quite seriously:—

'He was the only man, too, that did justice to my good breeding; and you may observe that I am well bred to a degree of needless scrupulosity. No man,' continued he, not observing the amazement of his hearers—'no man is so cautious not to interrupt others; no man thinks it so necessary to appear attentive when others are speaking; no man so steadily refuses preference to himself, or so willingly bestows it on another, as I do; nobody holds so strongly as I do the necessity of ceremony and the ill effects which follow the breach of it; yet people think me rude: but Bernard did me justice.'—Vol. i. p. 59.

Nor do the additional letters to Mrs. Thrale, on her second marriage, make any change in our previous impressions of Dr. Johnson's feelings and conduct, except so far as we have been taken in by Macaulay's sounding sentences. But, in fact, we have ourselves to blame if we ever give implicit trust to those fine rounded periods, which carry inaccuracy on the face of them. Truth of detail will never fit into that sort of writing; all that we ought to look for is a fairly correct, general impression: the facts of the case are clearly made subordinate to a striking effect. We are glad, then, to find that Johnson did not break utterly with his old friend; that in his last letter to her on this subject he expresses gratitude, which was certainly due, and writes:—

'Whatever I can contribute to your happiness I am ever ready to repay, for that kindness which soothed twenty years of a life radically wretched.'—Vol. i. p. 128.

Nothing again can be made of the charge of inconsistency. His words and his conduct were perfectly natural, and to his honour. All the fluctuations of feeling between old affection and new displeasure, the resolutions never again to speak of the affair, that were broken; the renewals of former tenderness that came to nothing, were inevitable, where the past affection and the present indignation were both real. It was a struggle, and that was all. That indignation and even disgust were warranted, we think can hardly be disputed, though every indecorous and ridiculous marriage is defensible if we will not allow public opinion a voice. Mr. Hayward, the compiler and editor of these volumes, maintains, against some seemingly creditable evidence, that Mrs. Piozzi never regarded her second marriage as a degradation: we answer that to believe, as she did, that every other person regarded it in this light, was to believe it herself. It is universal, unanimous opinion which settles such questions; this is virtually

the only appeal. But it is not very easy to know what the editor thinks on the question. It is a point of honour with biographers to whitewash their subject whenever it is possible; so he gravely defends Piozzi from Dr. Johnson's querulous atttack on his looks. 'Why, ma'am, he is not only a stupid old dog, but he is an ugly 'dog, too,' giving vouchers for passable good looks and suitable age. When it comes to the point, it is not easy to find influential arguments to divert a person from a resolution to play the fool. She knew that Piozzi was a singing-master, and had been an opera singer; she knew that he was a foreigner, who could hardly make himself intelligible in English; she knew all the grave objections on the score of religion and station. Johnson might think disparagement of his person as good an engine of attack as he could devise, or he might find this the readiest mode of venting his ill-humour on his own account, and that of the outraged first husband. The precise terms in which people express bitter disappointment on such startling occasions are really not worth discussing. Nor is it a great deal that self mingled with more generous sorrow, and interposed its own regrets. He had been comfortable at Streatham; good dinners, in good company, had contributed no doubt to his enjoyment; his feelings and his ease were invaded by the same blow.

The marriage with Piozzi turned out much better on the face of it than friends and enemies expected: many gloomy prophecies had the common fate of such prognostics. He was respectable in his conduct, attentive to his wife, and careful of her money; and we are led to agree with Lady Keith, the eldest Miss Thrale, in her subsequent judgment, that she could not blame a man for marrying a rich and distinguished woman who had fallen in love with him. But the marriage had its appropriate harvest of ill-fruits, notwithstanding—to be found in the general loss of respect, in the separation from her daughters, in the breaking of all old ties; but mainly in its effects upon herself. Mrs. Thrale had probably never possessed an affectionate nature; and her education as a clever, precocious, spoilt, paraded only child—a 'fondled favourite,' as she expresses it—while it developed her intellect, did not cultivate her heart: her character being further sophisticated by a strange tutor, a Dr. Collier, who at sixty seems to have had the art of making his young pupils in love with him. But this second marriage turned all to gall. The celebrity she had acquired as Mrs. Thrale and Dr. Johnson's friend, made public contempt intolerable to her; henceforth every consideration was sacrificed to self-defence, and to retorting upon those who had slighted her. To this she sacrificed the memory of her first husband, laying bare, and probably exaggerating, his faults and sins, and assert-

ing their mutual indifference. To this she renounced every sentiment of a mother, speaking unlovingly of her children to every fresh acquaintance, and leaving a legacy of cold censure and faint praise, worse than blame, to perpetuate the bitterness of a lifetime after death. Every action, every letter, every dealing, is coloured by it; every old friend thrown over. She lived in the past, and yet hated it for its contrast with the present. As a proof, she had a most choice collection of portraits of the distinguished circle at Streatham, remarkable for the subjects and for the artist who drew them, for most of them were Sir Joshua's: not urged by want of money, but from mere spite at old times and old friends, she sold them all. Possessed of vigorous health, lively spirits, and a ready wit, she could not be unhappy; but ever after her false step there was a strain to seem happier than she was, to parade her felicity to the world, to write letters and books about it, to express it by flighty and out-of-the-way methods. We are allowed to see no regrets; but her praises of Piozzi have constantly the air of being dictated by a restless desire to justify the step she has taken; and a consciousness of failure, of having made a life-long mistake, is we think discernible through all. In her first marriage her position was dignified; her conversation brilliant; her manner, as we are told, charming. After her second marriage, everything is effort: she sought out new friends; she lived in public; she assumed a tawdry dress; there was a restless desire for display, and for the old homage. She *would* not be put aside or forgotten.

It is hard for any one to live creditably on a past reputation, even if they have not damaged it like Mrs. Thrale. Perhaps the trial is greatest to women; they cling with tenacity to the period when, in their own little sphere, they were famous. All the life they care for was there. How much that is ridiculous in old age may be traced to this! A woman looks back to the time when she was in the world's eye, and her only idea of remaining in it is to ignore time, and hold by the old ideal—painted cheeks, flippant talk, reiterated anecdotes, a memory ransacked, and old stories tossed over and over, being all that is left of what was once an attraction. It is well for all to have a past, but the way to keep it fresh is to have a present as well, and one that suits our condition and actual circumstances, and in which it is not painful to keep exact account of the years as they go by. Keeping pace with the time has its resigned religious meaning, which those miss who worship any part of their past existence. Not that Mrs. Piozzi did not especially pique herself on doing so; she eagerly kept herself *au courant*. These letters, written between her seventy-fifth and eighty-first years, are full of the news of the day: she would not willingly

allow any topic to pass without a sharp comment, or miss any popular attraction. She was encouraged to write them by the compliments of her new friend, Sir James Fellowes; and the editor boasts of them as remarkable compositions. But the reader cannot but feel that to collect and transmit the scattered recollections and remains of a lively, coquettish old age is not a charitable office. The egotism that can no longer be held in check, the affectation which was once grace, the flippancy that once looked like ease, the gingle of verses, the false criticism which cannot take to what is new, the dim insight into self, and somewhat vapid reflections on time and death,—the old stories, old epigrams, old compliments, old impromptus, flowing at random from the facile but worn-out pen,—suggest but an unsatisfactory picture. A good memory is not set at its highest value when crammed with old *vers de société*. Nor is the elasticity found most attractive which intersperses an exact record of every new dancer, actor, and singer, with moral reflections and ejaculations on the fleetness of life and the impending grave—a favourite topic with Mrs. Piozzi, but curiously mixed up with ill omens for the world she is leaving, and with prophecies of its approaching dissolution, as though there was comfort in the thought, *après moi le déluge*. It is difficult to find every characteristic in one example, and in the following the gaieties and smaller entertainments of the day are not touched upon; but it expresses her habitual state of feeling, and shows her style:—

'(Jour de Naissance, 27th January.)

'Tuesday night, 16th January, 1816.

'My dear Sir James Fellowes will like a long independent letter about a thousand other people and things. When I am one of the family cluster, we can think only of you. Yet poor old Dr. Harington must be thought of: he will be seen no more. Was it not pretty and affecting, that they played his fine sacred music so lately, and, by dint of loud and reiterated applause, called him forward, as he was retiring, to thank him for their entertainment? He returned, bowed, went home, sickened, and ——! This was a classical conclusion of his life indeed; like the characters at the end of Terence's plays, who cry, *Valete omnes et plaudite!* But I would wish a less public exit, and say *Vale* to my nearest friend, *Voi altri applaudite* to the rest.

'*A propos*, did you ever read Spencer's long string of verses, every stanza ending with wife, children, and friends? I can neither find nor recollect them rightly; but too well does my then hurt mind retain my answer to a lady (one of the Burneys) who quoted a line expressive of contempt for general admiration, giving us in this passage, which I *do* remember:—

'"Away with the laurel; o'er *me* wave the willow,
Set up by the hand of wife, children, and friends."

My reply was, "No; for," said I,

'"Should love domestic plant the tree,
Hope still would be defeated;
Children and friends would crowd to see
The neighbouring cattle eat it."'

* * * * *

Then follow four more stanzas, showing how transient is domestic regret, figured in the willow; how envious are friends, and the like; and concluding with praise of the laurel:—

'"And should the berries e'er invite
Some envious, nibbling neighbour,
A blistered tongue succeeds the bite,
And best repays their labour."

'Did you believe I could ever have expressed myself with so much bitterness? But if people will break the heart even of an apricot, sweetest and most insipid of all fruits, the kernel will yield a harsh flavour.

'Poor Dr. Harington, like myself, has found the kindness that sweetened his existence always from without doors, never from within.

'My cough is no longer a bad one, but the hoarseness does not go off: and when I tried to tell old stories last night, to amuse, I found the voice very odious; so Sir James Fellowes is best off now, that has me for a correspondent. Don't you remember, in some of my stuff, how Johnson said, if he was married to Lady Cotton, he would live a hundred miles away from her, and make her write to him once a week"? Added he, "I could bear a letter from the creature, but it is the poorest talker, sure, that ever opened lips."

'Well, if you asked the pretty girls to tell you the colour of the wind, and explain to you the tint of the storm, they would say the storm rose, I imagine, and the wind blew. We used to spell the colour so in my young days.

'Meanwhile, the geological maps of what is to be discovered underground are fine things, certainly; but I feel so completely expectant of going to make strata myself, that the science does not much allure me; although I am *deeply* concerned in it at seventy-five years old. Dear me! 'tis a silly thing to try to extract sunbeams from cucumbers, like Swift's projector in "Gulliver's Travels."

'Princess Charlotte has at length made her choice, it seems, of le Prince de Saxe-Coburg, a handsome man, and she thinks so. Without that power of making impression, beauty in either sex is a complete nihility. Find me a better word, and that shall be turned out by her who wishes to keep best in every sense for you.

'Your faithful,

'H. L. P.'

—*Ibid.* vol. ii. p. 146.

What she says is true. The pleasures of her life never came from within-doors, except the reservation she forgets this time to make—Mr. Piozzi himself. To please her husband, or to spite her daughters, she had adopted a nephew of his, when only a child of four years old. He was educated as an Englishman, and naturalized, assuming her maiden name of Salusbury. He seems to have turned out well and creditably to her; but she derived little satisfaction from the child whom she endowed with her fortune. There is a constant suspicion in her tone towards him, though they were good friends, and she gave up a

great deal to him. She needed the flattery and the fuss of new friendship; she liked to have some one *fresh* to observe and report the compliments and fine things which her visiting circle bestowed upon her; for she was a lion and a wonder in her Bath set; and the politeness and deference of her admirers could be most securely reckoned on, and the little flutter of shamefaced vanity could indulge itself more easily with them. She could report naturally such agreeable homage, as—

'Did I tell you the conquest I made in Wales of the Bishop of St. Asaph, Luxmore? He says now, "What is become of that little Mrs. Piozzi, who shone here amongst us like a meteor for a month or two, and then away? When will she return, do you know? We are very dull without her." And so they are, sure enough; no cards, no music, nor no conversation, except the petty quarrels which infest all counties distant from the metropolis, round whose central globe we roll at different distances; and Denbighshire is Saturnian in every sense of the word: their sorrows and their joys are so stupid.'—Vol. ii. p. 254.

Denbighshire, though her property lay in it, and she had lived much there in Piozzi's time, was not a natural home for such a spirit—we can excuse a lively old lady for preferring Bath—but there is something painful in the little contrasts she intimates between the cold attentions of her adopted son, whom she had established on her Welsh estate, and the flattery of general society. The Conway, whom she next mentions, was an actor, for whom she got up a violent fancy. This admiration gave rise to reports which we think hardly warranted. She knew quite well that she was eighty, and felt this a justification of any language or other mode in which she might choose to express her approval:—

'Kind Conway has promised me a proof mezzo-tinto of his likeness in the character of Jaffier, by Harlowe; he says yours by Pellegrini is alive with resemblance. What will Salusbury say, when he comes first to dinner at aunt's house? whom he considers as a superannuated old goose, while she is petted, and flattered, and fed with soft dedication, all day long.'—Vol. ii. p. 288.

It is likely that the Bath world should be better pleased than those immediately belonging to her, with the vivacity of an old lady who chose to celebrate her eighty-first birthday with a fête to 700 people, herself leading off the dance with '*astonishing* elasticity.' We do not know how far the enjoyment was real, or had heart in it, interspersed as it is with such reflections as, 'No matter! the farce must go on till the curtain drops; and if 'everybody left off their disguisings as they grew old, why age 'would appear still more a deformity than at present!' and, 'Dear me! how sick, how thrice sick I am of these parties! so 'falsely called society: for one idea in common with them I 'possess not. Yet one must live among people one cannot care

'about, in order to serve those who really amuse and delight 'one.' Again, after the theatre, 'Music and dancing are no 'longer what they were, and I grow less pleased with both 'every hour,'—but it was all she was capable of, and whatever the amount of satisfaction, society, and talking, and a prominent place, were essential, as all habits must be in old age. When hoarseness silences her, she writes, 'a mute Piozzi is a miserable thing indeed.' No recollections were pleasant to her that could not be put in the form of an anecdote to be told. Solitary reflection had no charm; the neglect of her children, through whatever cause, was a continual sore, and so was the estrangement of early friends. She never names either without bitterness. Her daughters she pronounces to be worldly and utterly without heart; her old friends, from Johnson downwards, to have been influenced by merely selfish motives; so that she declares herself to have thought 'that there existed not a human 'creature that cared for poor H. L. P. now she had no longer 'money to be robbed of.' However, the friends made in her seventy-sixth year restored her to charity with her species—the friends who brought strangers to see her 'as the first woman in England.' To these friends she confesses, '*I* was 'selfish *once*, and but *once* in my life; and though they lost 'nothing by my second marriage, my friends (as one's relations 'are popularly called) never could be persuaded to forgive it.' She had placed herself in the unhappy position of having constantly, and through a life, to defend herself at the expense of her friends, and hers was just the mind to satisfy itself with seeming candour; she was always taking her own side without any real apprehension of the other. That her daughters deserve the testimony to their worth the editor bestows on them, receives confirmation from the following letter on the death of Mrs. Piozzi:—

'Hotwells, May 5th, 1821.

'Dear Miss Willoughby.—It is my painful task to communicate to you, who have so lately been the kind associate of dearest Mrs. Piozzi, the irreparable loss we have all sustained in that incomparable woman and beloved friend.

'She closed her varied life about nine o'clock on Wednesday, after an illness of ten days, with as little suffering as could be imagined under these awful circumstances. Her bedside was surrounded by her weeping daughters: Lady Keith and Mrs. Hoare arrived in time to be fully recognised. Miss Thrale, who was absent from town, only just before she expired, had but the satisfaction of seeing her breathe her last in peace.

'Nothing could behave with more tenderness and propriety than these ladies, whose conduct, I am convinced, has been much misrepresented and calumniated by those who have only attended to one side of the history; but may all that is past be now buried in oblivion. Retrospection seldom improves our view of any subject. Sir John Salusbury was too distant, the

close of her illness being too rapid for us to entertain any expectation of his arriving in time to see the dear deceased.

'He only reached Clifton *last* night. I have not yet seen him; my whole time has been devoted to the afflicted ladies. To you, who so well knew my devoted attachment to Mrs. Piozzi, it is quite superfluous to speak of my *own* feelings, which I well know will become more *acute*, as the present hurry of business, in which we are all engaged, and the extreme bodily fatigue I have undergone, producing a sort of stupor in my mind, subsides. . . .

'P. S. PENNINGTON.'

We further learn that her death was calm; that her last words were, 'I die in the trust and the fear of God.' This letter not only places the daughters in an amiable light; it does more for the character of Mrs. Piozzi than all the work beside. Of course, written under excitement, every word must not be weighed; but we gather from it that Mrs. Piozzi was capable of inspiring a thoughtful and amiable person, as the writer shows herself to be, with a sincere and warm attachment. It sets us defending the poor old lady against her own picture of herself. She was better than her pen would show her to be—more genuine, more attractive, more loveable. As we have said, many things in her career were against her, and the world was hard upon her. That she was a woman of uncommon talent, spirit, and energy, worthy of Dr. Johnson's companionship, when in her prime, we cannot doubt. But the celebrity his friendship brought, took up her time, and unfitted her in every way for a mother's first duties. Her children were secondary to a great many things, and she never learnt to love them, or taught them to love her. She had a husband whom, it seems, she could not respect, and who, she asserts, bestowed on others the love that was her due. During his life-time, Johnson's society was an alleviation as well as distinction. She had much to put up with in ministering to his habits, and enduring his peculiarities, but there were equivalents which largely counterbalanced these inconveniences. After her husband's death, he soon became a restraint. Her mind was one that could submit to the inevitable, but was restive against minor hindrances. She broke her way through what most women think impossibilities, and had spirit not to be crushed by the consequences of her own act. Certainly, the world was very insolent towards her. She was the theme of newspapers; all sorts of impertinences were let loose upon her, in a strain to lead us to congratulate ourselves in an improvement in social morals. Her self-assertion rose above all. She affected to find the society of her husband's friends in Italy fully equal to that she had left behind. She threw herself into the interests of their pseudo-literary circle, and caught the knack of impromptus and epigrams with the readiness which had always enabled her to take the lead; all which is recorded

in her account of her visit to Italy. The sham cleverness seemingly satisfied her like the real she had left behind. Her vanity, at least, was satisfied by the pre-eminence given to her, and the compliments bestowed on her talents, her beauty, and her virtue. Even the conventional love-making, addressed to her at forty-five, though a joke, was yet a piquante one. She was still a centre of a circle, a necessity with her for the remainder of her life; there was still employment for her pen, herself the central figure. That she had an ingenious and ready pen, her celebrated 'Three Warnings' prove. She could turn a verse very easily; her classical acquirements, though not constituting her a learned woman, yet improved her power over words. Still, nothing in these volumes, given as specimens of her style, are worth reading; and the edition can only hint with apologetic reserve at her latest work, 'Retrospection,' which seems to have been a *résumé* of the world's proceedings from the Deluge to her own day. It was during its composition that she is described by one (Lord Normanby, we believe) who spent a day with her at Brynbella, the name of her place in Denbighshire. She showed him her bedroom; the floor of which was covered with huge books of reference for this work. 'She was,' he says, 'certainly, what was called, and is still called, blue; and that of 'a deep tint, but good-humoured and lively, though affected. 'Her husband, a quiet civil man, with his head full of nothing 'but music.'

The history of her second marriage may, we think, teach a lesson in prudence and charity. Both are generally set at nought on the first announcement of a strange and outrageous marriage. Society may protest, when its own reasonable code is broken; but the tone towards the offenders, too often, as it were, denies them benefit of clergy: they are treated as though nothing that was now said could do them good or harm; we take no account of their souls; the words of old friends and neighbours crush or harden as the case may be. Coldness and silent displeasure from those who had a right to show offence in Mrs. Thrale's case, and an absence of all comment in the press on a matter not within their province, would have told as effectually in the way of convincing her she had wronged her children, and done a foolish thing, and would not have injured her moral tone to the same degree. Every circle learns its experiences in such matters. Mrs. Thrale's case furnishes a lesson to the world at large.

Here, at least, ends all the teaching of every sort Mrs. Piozzi has to give; her name can rise no more on the surface of current literature. She supposed her last remains important; she was constantly arranging matters to look best to posterity: but once glanced over, her celebrity falls back on its only claim

to it—her association with Dr. Johnson, as the one woman he preferred for constant intercourse and most intimate confidence. We may not take the same final leave of Mrs. Delany. The three weighty volumes of her correspondence, already given to the world, are only an instalment. What remains behind, how many more are to follow, the editor gives us no intimation; and as many pages may be in store to exhibit a good woman in serene, pious, and honoured old age, as have been spent in depicting stroke by stroke her life of action, spent in the world, but guided by higher rules—religious, moral, and prudential—than, in any age, direct the conduct or form the habits of society at large.

ART. VI. — *Codex Alexandrinus.* H ΚΑΙΝΗ ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ. *Novum Testamentum Græce ex antiquissimo codice Alexandrino a* C. G. WOIDE *olim descriptum: ad fidem ipsius codicis denuo accuratius edidit* B. H. COWPER. Londini; David Nutt, et Williams & Norgate; Edinburgæ: Williams & Norgate. MDCCCLX.

WE were once talking with the late president of Magdalen College, Dr. Routh, about the manuscripts of the Greek Testament, when he made the following remark: 'You see, sir, it 'is possible that a manuscript may yet be found as old as any 'that we now have, perhaps even older.' The words of the venerable theologian have proved to be almost a prophecy. The remarkable discovery by Professor Tischendorf of the 'Codex Sinaiticus' bids fair, if the professor be right in his estimate, exactly to fulfil Dr. Routh's anticipation. In a recent number[1] we drew attention to the interesting 'Notitia,' with which Professor Tischendorf has favoured the Christian world, as the first instalment of his most valuable contribution to the documentary evidence for the Greek text of the Old and New Testaments. The seasonable appearance of a reprint from Woide's noble but expensive facsimile edition of the 'Codex Alexandrinus,' invites us now to devote a short space to the consideration of our own national treasure.

The 'Codex Alexandrinus' (denoted by the letter 'A' in the critical editions of the New Testament) was brought by Sir Thomas Roe, on his return to London from an embassy to the Porte in 1628, as a present to Charles I. from Cyril Lucar, patriarch, first of Alexandria, then of Constantinople. The same patriarch gave to Archbishop Laud the Arabic Pentateuch now in the Bodleian library.[2] He was strangled 27th of June, 1638, by order of the Sultan.

The MS. had been brought from Alexandria by Cyril Lucar; and a note in the MS. itself informs us that it was given in the year 1098, 'cubiculo patriarchali Alexandriæ;' that is (probably) to the library of the patriarch of Alexandria, where it seems to have remained until it was taken by Cyril Lucar to Constantinople. This is perhaps the origin of its name.

[1] See *Christian Remembrancer*, January, 1861. The selected readings given in the *Notitia* have been printed in a size uniform with that of Tischendorf's *editio septima* of the Greek Testament; the half sheet is supplied (we believe gratuitously) to all purchasers of that edition.

[2] Numbered 'Laud 258.'

Another account states that the MS. was found at Mount Athos. It was given by King George II. in 1753 to the British Museum, where it now is.

The MS. was first examined by Patrick Young (or Junius), the royal librarian; then by Alexander Huissius, whose collation is inserted in Walton's 'Polyglott.' Bishops Fell and Pearson had the MS. sent to Dr. Thomas Smith, fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, with a view of having an edition made; but their death seems to have cut the work short. The name of Fell, however, appears among the collators; to which may be added the names of Mill, Grabe, Wetstein. In 1786 Woide published a facsimile edition of the New Testament with copious prolegomena; he also appended notes embodying the labours of former collators, and a comparison of the readings in the MS. with those in Kuster's edition of Mill's Greek Testament. A facsimile edition of the LXX. was published by H. H. Baber; the first volume in 1816, the second volume in 1819, the third volume in 1821; the prolegomena and notes in 1828. This edition is said to be inferior to that of Woide;[1] but it is certainly a very handsome work; and we are not at present concerned with it, except so far as it helps to illustrate that portion of the MS. to which the New Testament belongs.

The MS. consists of four volumes. The three first contain the LXX. version. The fourth contains the canonical books of the New Testament, the 1st Epistle of S. Clement to the Corinthians, and part of the 2d Epistle attributed to S. Clement. We propose at present to speak merely of the part containing the New Testament. The leaves have been unhappily lost, from S. Matthew i, 1 to S. Matthew xxv, 7, where the New Testament portion commences with the words *εξερχεσθε εις απαντησιν αυτου*. Two leaves have been lost out of S. John's Gospel; here the MS. breaks off at the word *καταβαινων*, vi. 50; and recommences viii. 52 with *γεις i.e.* part of *λεγεις*. Three more leaves are wanting in 2 Cor. Here the MS. breaks off in iv. 13, at *γεγραμμε i.e.* part of *γεγραμμενον*; and recommences in xii. 7 with *ηυπερβολη i.e.* part of *και τη υπερβολη*.

For a description of the form and appearance of the MS. we may borrow a short passage from Mr. Cowper's introduction.

'The portion containing the New Testament is a volume measuring somewhat more than ten inches wide and fourteen inches high. The material is thin, fine, and very beautiful vellum, often discoloured at the edges, which have been injured by time, but more by the ignorance or carelessness of the

[1] 'Quam parum vero editor Veteris Testamenti Henr. Herv. Baber susceptæ rei satisfecerit, exposui in Prolegomenis editionis meæ Veteris Testamenti Græci.' —*Tisch. Prol. N. T. p.* cxxxvi. *note.*

modern binder, who has not always spared the text, especially at the upper inner margin. The manuscript is written in a light and elegant hand in uncial letters. These letters at the end of a line are often very small, and much of the writing is very pale and faint. Each page contains two columns of text. In the margins to the left hand, the Eusebian canons are noted throughout the four Gospels, as well as the larger sections into which these books were anciently divided. Some of the numeral letters, and the commencement of the separate books throughout have been written in red ink, as also are some of the ornamental portions, which are due to the fancy of the scribe. These letters are sometimes diversified with other colours.'—*Introduction*, pp. iii. iv.

The number of leaves now in the volume (including the Epistles of S. Clement) is, according to Mr. Cowper, 143. Int. p. vi. *note.*

The MS. is written in uncial characters; there is no division of words except at the end of one and the beginning of another paragraph. There are no accents or breathings. Of interpunction there is but little trace, and what there is seems sometimes very arbitrary. The point most in use is the Greek colon (·); the point (—) also occurs. But it often happens that the point falls 'between words grammatically connected, and even in the middle of a word.'—(Intr. p. viii.) It does not appear that any great use can be made of these points for critical purposes. The system of paragraphs approaches more nearly to a definite division of the text; these are very numerous; and there is a considerable space between the end of one paragraph and the beginning of another. This beginning is marked by a larger initial letter, with the following curious modification: when the new paragraph commences in the middle of a line, the larger initial letter is reserved for the first letter at the commencement of the line following, even though that first letter may happen to be in the middle of a word.[1] At the end of a line, the letters are sometimes written smaller, in order to get in an extra word or two. There is no ι subscript or adscript. A difference in the ink, parchment, formation of letters, &c. seems to indicate that the original MS. was written by more than one scribe; these differences Woide describes. Throughout the MS. there are erasures, alterations, additions. 'Corrections 'properly so called are frequent, and it is not always possible 'to decide whether they are by the first, second, or third hand.' (Intr. p. v.) The inscriptions and subscriptions to each book are ancient but not always from the first hand. The MS. has the Alexandrine forms λημψονται, ανειλαν, &c.; also the usual itacisms αι for ε, ε for αι, &c.

In the Gospels are the Ammonian sections accompanied by

[1] *Eg.* ΑΥΤΟΥ ΤΟΤΕΗΓΕΡΘΗCΑΝΠΙΑ
ΟΑΙΑΙΠΑΡΘΕΝΟΙ κ.τ.λ.

the Eusebian canons. A list of numbered τίτλοι or larger sections is prefixed to each gospel, and these are again written in their respective places at the top of the page, their exact place in the text being designated by a mark at the left margin, ϛ in S. Matthew and S. Mark, by + or × in S. Luke and S. John. In the Acts, Catholic Epistles, Pauline Epistles there are no Euthalian sections, though there are paragraphs and periods marked by larger initial letters. There are no Andrean sections in the Apocalypse. There are the usual short methods of writing $\overline{\Theta C}$ $\overline{KC}$ $\overline{ANOC}$ $\overline{OYNOC}$ $\overline{\Delta A\Delta}$, &c.

The Epistle to the Hebrews comes between 2 Thessalonians and 1 Timothy. A similar arrangement is found in the Codex Sinaiticus, and in the Codex Vaticanus; in this latter, however, the numeral letters at the margin show that in the MS. from which it was copied, the Epistle to the Hebrews came between the Epistle to the Galatians and the Epistle to the Ephesians.

Inserted in the first volume is a note in Arabic, and another note in the handwriting of Cyril Lucar, stating a tradition that the MS. both of the Old and New Testaments was written by Thecla, an Egyptian lady, shortly after the Council of Nice.[1] Prefixed to the Psalms are the epistle to Marcellinus, ascribed to Athanasius; Eusebii in Psalmos Hypotheses; περιοχαι εις τους ψαλμους, and a table containing the κανονες ημεριοι ψαλμων and the κανονες νυκτερινοι των ψαλμων. The Magnificat and other hymns from the Old and New Testaments are appended to the Psalms, the former being entitled προσευχη μαριας της θεοτοκου. Among the hymns is the υμνος εωθινος.

In the first volume is also a list of the books of the Old and New Testaments, the latter being given as follows:[2]—

Η ΚΑΙΝΗΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ (in red ink)

ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΑ $\bar{\Delta}$

ΚΑΤΑ ΜΑΤΘ[ΑΙ]ΟΝ

ΚΑΤΑ ΜΑΡΚΟ[Ν]

ΚΑΤΑ ΛΟΥΚΑ[Ν]

---

[1] Tischendorf conjectures that the MS. may have come 'ex celebri S. Theclæ cœnobio Seleucensi, quod jam Gregorii Nazianzeni tempore florebat.'—*Prol. N. T.* p. cxxxvi. note. Facsimiles of the two notes are given in Baber, Vol. I.

[2] The list (part of which appeared in the last number of the *Christian Remembrancer*) is taken from Baber's facsimile, the bracketed letters in the text denoting the letters which are entirely missing in Baber. The portions bracketed as now illegible in Mr. Cowper's list (Int. pp. xiii. xiv.) are somewhat different. Woide brackets none.

ΚΑΤΑ ΙΩΑΝΝ[Η]Ν
ΠΡΑΞΕΙϹ ΑΠΟϹ[Τ]ΟΛΩΝ
ΚΑΘΟΛΙΚΑΙ $\overline{Ζ}$
ΕΠΙϹΤΟΛΑΙ ΠΑ[ΥΛ]ΟΥ $\overline{ΙΔ}$
ΑΠΟΚΑΛΥΨΙ[Ϲ ΙΩΑ]ΝΝΟΥ
Κ[Λ]ΗΜΕΝΤΟϹ [ΕΠΙϹΤΟ]ΛΗ $\overline{Α}$
[ΚΛΗΜ]ΕΝΤΟϹ Ε[ΠΙϹΤΟΛΗ] $\overline{Β}$
[ΟΜ]ΟΥΒΙΒΛΙΑ (erasure)
ΨΑΛΜ[Ο]Ι ϹΟΛΟΜ[Ω]ΝΤΟϹ
ΙΗ[1]

On the list written in this order Woide has the following remarks:—'Ex hoc ordine palam est, Epistolas Clementis nontantum adscribi calci librorum N. T. uti Libri Apocryphi adduntur, *sed etiam, quod majus est*, adnumerari libris Canonicis Scripturæ N. T. quorum summa ΚΘ, 29, olim addita fuit ad lineam *ομου βιβλια*, sed nunc deperdita est. . . . Idem fecerat librarius in initio catalogi V. T. ubi cum libros 5 Mosis et librum Josuæ, Judicum et Ruth recensuisset addit hoc modo *ομου βιβλια. η̄.*'

Such is an outline of the principal facts connected with this famous MS. The important questions, When was the MS. written? and Where? do not fall within our present purpose to discuss. It will be sufficient simply to observe that, whatever may be thought of the tradition which assigns the writing of the MS. to Thecla, the tradition certainly points to Egypt as the country where it was written. With this agree the shape of the letters, the spelling of the words, the state of the text; to which may be added a curious circumstance, first (as we believe) remarked by Mr. Cowper, which shall be described in his own words (Int. p. xxii.):—

'The MS. has been ornamented, more especially at the close of each book, by some one, and in all probability by the original scribe. The ornaments are some of them very peculiar, and the question naturally occurs whether they furnish any clue to the country of the Codex. Many of them bear a striking resemblance to similar ornaments in some of the very ancient Syriac MSS. which are now in our National Museum, all of which have been brought from Egypt, and many of them are known to have been written there. There is one, however, of especial interest, and this, in an unexpected manner, confirms the opinion that Codex A. was written in Egypt. At the end of the Catholic epistles, two baskets of fruit are

[1] These numerals are given once only in Baber, twice in Woide and Mr. Cowper.

depicted in coloured inks. These baskets are of a peculiar form and texture, being narrower at the bottom than at the top, and apparently of fancy wicker work. Each of them is filled with fruit, and this fruit is piled up in a pyramidal form above the basket, in regularly decreasing tiers or courses. Happening to visit the Egyptian Gallery of the British Museum, we observed, upon one of the walls, fragments of an Egyptian painting, representing, among other things, baskets of fruit. The resemblance of these to those in Codex A. is so striking, that we mentally uttered a *ευρηκα* as we looked at them.'

It is certainly not a little extraordinary, that the Egyptian Gallery in the British Museum should have furnished so remarkable an illustration of the venerable MS. its next door neighbour. Mr. Cowper remarks, 'that the figures given by Woide, in his edition, are nothing like the originals.' (Int. pp. xxii. xxiii.) We may add, that in Baber, vol. iii. p. 531, may be seen a beautiful facsimile of a fruit-basket, answering to Mr. Cowper's description. With regard to the date of the MS. Woide, after a careful survey of the data furnished by the MS. itself, places it 'intra medium et finem seculi quarti.' Tischendorf places it later—'medio fere sæculo quinto.' With him agree Dr. Tregelles and Mr. Cowper.

The edition of Woide professes to represent the MS. in facsimile. Mr. Cowper's edition is the first attempt at reducing the MS. into the ordinary cursive characters, the words being separated, marked with breathings and accents, and punctuated. The volume is portable and neatly printed. In the preface is much useful matter, from which we have just given an interesting extract; but those who wish to have a full statement and discussion of the merits of the MS. must have recourse to the prolegomena of Woide. We regret to find, in the preface, some misprints in the accentuation at p. xxv. In line 1, *κανόνες* is printed without an accent. The numerical letters of the Psalms in the *κανόνες ἡμερινοί*, are printed *η`. κθ`.*, &c., instead of *η΄. κθ΄*, &c. A similar error pervades all the numerical letters both for the hours and the psalms in the *κανόνες νυκτερινοί*. Nor is this blemish confined to the preface. In Mt. xxvi. 16, we have *ἀργύρα* for *ἀργυρᾶ*; xxvi. 36, *ἀν* for *ἂν*; xxvi. 48, *ἔαν* for *ἐὰν*; xxvii. 35, *βάλοντες* for *βαλόντες*; xxvii. 52, *μνημάτα* for *μνήματα*. Mk. i. 39, *συναγώγας* for *συναγωγὰς*.[1] The punctuation, too, seems deficient in certain instances—*e.g.* Mt. xxvi. 65, *ὅτι ἐβλασφήμησεν τί ἔτι χρείαν ἔχομεν μαρτύρων*;—there is no stop after *ἐβλασφήμησεν*. Again, in the same verse—*Ἴδε, νῦν ἠκούσατε τὴν βλασφημείαν αὐτοῦ τί ὑμῖν δοκεῖ*;—there is no stop after *αὐτοῦ*.

[1] Mark v. 20, *ἀκῆλθεν*; v. 23, *παρακάλει* for *παρακαλεῖ*; vi. 23, *ἐάν* for *ἐὰν*. In Woide, the marginal sections, *νη, ξ, ξγ*, in S. Mark belong respectively, to vi. 15, vi. 19, vi. 32. Mr. Cowper has misplaced them at vi. 16, vi. 21, vi. 34, respectively. Mk. ix. 28, *ἐκβάλειν*. x. 7, *γυναῖκι*. 24, *τέκνια*. xi. 3, *ἀποστελλεῖ*.

But a very serious variation from the text of Woide, and we may add, from the MS. itself, remains to be pointed out. In Mt. xxvi. 3, Mr. Cowper's text exhibits, Τότε συνήχθησαν οἱ ἀχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι τοῦ λαοῦ, &c. In a note we read 'αχιερεις sic Codex.' But our readers will be surprised when they are informed that the words και οι γραμματεις are not in Woide at all. Besides, on the testimony of former collators—Young, Walton, Fell, Mill, Wetstein—it is, in Woide's notes, expressly said of these words, '*Desunt.*' We have ascertained that the words και οι γραμματεις are not in the MS.; and that αχιερεις is an error of Woide's, the MS. reading αρχιερεις. Yet Mr. Cowper says 'αχιερεις, sic Codex.' (!)

Again, Mk. vii. 36. Mr. Cowper's text exhibits ὅσον δὲ αὐτὸς αὐτοῖς διεστέλλετο, &c. But the word αυτος is not in Woide; and again, on the testimony of Young, Walton, Fell, Mill, Wetstein, it is said of the word, '*Deest.*' This departure from Woide's text requires explanation. Mr. Cowper has no note, and his table of errata is silent, on the point.

We come now to what may, perhaps, be considered the most valuable part in Mr. Cowper's edition, viz. his correction of the errors in Woide. It may be well to cite, in the first instance, how his edition was prepared, according to his own statement (Int. p. xxxi.):—

"The work of Woide has been taken as a basis, inasmuch as it was impracticable, and indeed unnecessary, to make an entirely new transcript of the original manuscript. Woide's facsimile has, therefore, been reduced to modern characters, with the addition of accents, aspirates, iota subscript, and pointing. In this process, the facsimile was religiously adhered to. All the missing portions have been supplied from Kuster's edition of Mill, and so inserted in brackets that they may easily be known. . . . Having so far prepared the text, the next step was to compare the text of Woide and collation with the other collations, and to make notes of all omissions and discrepancies. This process required great care, and was repeated in various forms. The list of passages was found to be large, and the uncertain readings thus brought to light were, some of them, of real importance. It appeared that several hundred readings had to be attested. Access to the manuscript was therefore solicited, and at once conceded in the most liberal spirit. Throughout the volume constant reference has been made to the original, and, in this way, not only were doubtful readings verified, but a good many actual errors in Woide's text have been brought to light and corrected."

We gather, then, from this, that Woide's facsimile was not compared line by line, word by word, letter by letter, with the MS., but that reference was only made to the MS. *pro re nata.* Further, we cannot understand how the errors pointed out above are consistent with the assertion that 'the work of Woide has been taken as a basis,' and that, 'in this process, the facsimile was religiously adhered to.' Had it not been for Mr. Cowper's

statement, we should have concluded that some other edition was taken as the basis; and that this was corrected, first by Woide, then by the MS. where it was thought necessary.

The corrections of Woide which Mr. Cowper has given are recorded in foot notes at the bottom of the page where the word or passage occurs.

Mr. Cowper has not, however, always specified among his corrections, those words which Woide had himself corrected, either in the preface or in the notes: *e.g.*, the very first correction which he gives of Woide's facsimile, occurs Mt. xxvii. 13, καταμαρτυρουσιν, on which Mr. Cowper's note is 'Sic Codex: Woide habet καταμαρτυρουσι, sed male.' Now in Woide's notes the reading is as Mr. Cowper gives it (no doubt correctly) in his text, καταμαρτυρουσιν. But as he is altogether silent about the discrepancy between Woide's text and Woide's notes, in respect to this word, he has (we think) in this one instance lost sight of the excellent rule which he had laid down for himself, viz., 'Having so far prepared the text, the next step was to compare the text of Woide, *and collation*, with the other collations, and to make notes of all omissions and discrepancies.' Now surely if Woide's error in the text was noticed, then in common fairness, Woide's right reading in the notes should have been noticed too. Again, John v. 3, την του υδατος κινησιν. Woide omits του in the text, but supplies it in the preface. Mr. Cowper very properly restores the του in his text. But in his note he says 'του ante υδατος omisit Woide,' without one word about Woide's correction given in the preface. There are, we think, seven instances of corrections made by Woide at the end of his preface, unacknowledged by Mr. Cowper.

Take another instance, *e converso*, James ii. 2. Woide reads εισηλθη. This reading we ourselves had verified, and we found it to be εισελθη. And εισελθη is (very properly) the reading in Mr. Cowper's text. But he has no note about the discrepancy between himself and Woide as to this reading.

We have attempted to make, in a rough way, a classification of Mr. Cowper's corrections of Woide's text, but cannot, without a much longer examination, pledge ourselves to perfect accuracy. In by far the greater number of instances, the correction consists in the substitution of long for short vowels, or *vice versâ*; *e.g.*:—

Mark vi. 8. W. ζονην. C. ζωνην.

Luke ix. 36. W. ευρηθη. C. ευρεθη. These two we had ourselves verified.

Of these corrections (including the words corrected by Woide himself, and the passage in S. James, mentioned above) there are forty-two.

There are seven instances of aspirate put for smooth consonants, *e.g.*—

Eph. iv. 1. W. εκληθηθε. C. εκληθητε.

W. πραοθητος. C. πραοτητος.

These two we had verified.

Rev. xii. 3. W. δραχων. C. δρακων.

There are two omissions of a final ν, *e.g.*:—

Heb. x. 1. W. εχω. C. εχων.

Luke xi. 14. W. εκβαλλω. C. εκβαλλων.

There are twelve instances where Woide has edited one letter for another, or has omitted or has repeated a word or syllable; *e.g.*:—

Rom. v. 17. W. διλ. C. δια.

Luke ii. 10. W. αγγελ. C. αγγελος.

Rev. ii. 8. W. λεγεγει. C. λεγει.

The corrections of grammatical or doctrinal importance are as follows:—

Mark xv. 21. Woide edits το σταυρον.

C. το[ν] σταυρον, with this note: 'Woide legit το; aderat forte ν, sed abscissum est.'

Luke xxii. 7. W. ηλθεν δε ημερα των αζυμων.

C. adds η before ημερα.

2 Pet. i. 21. W. ου γαρ θεληματι ανθρωπου ηνεχθη ποτε η προφητεια. C. omits η.

Jude i. W. τοις εν τω πατρι ηγαπημενοις.

C. for τω reads Θεω.

5. W. εκ της αιγυπτου.

C. for της reads γης.

Rom. vi. 1. W. επιμενωμεν εν τη αμαρτια.

C. omits εν.

Rom. xiv. 23. W. παν δε ο ουκ ο εκ πιστεως.

C. omits the second ο.

Heb. iii. 8. W. μη σκληρυνετε.

C. μη σκληρυνητε.

Mr. Cowper, in pp. x. xi. of his introduction, gives an useful list of the peculiarities in the orthography of A—*e.g.* the very common itacism of αι for ε, καινον for κενον, μαι for με, or, again, of ι for ει, as ιμι for ειμι; or the neglect of assimilation, as ανγελος for αγγελος.

Some of these are mentioned in Woide: a longer list is given in Baber.

These peculiarities Mr. Cowper has retained in his text; the reader must not, therefore, be surprised at reading ἰνὶ for ἑνὶ, Matt. xxv. 45, μαι for με, Matt. xxvi. 35, δίγνυσιν for δείκνυσιν, John v. 20. It may be questioned whether such a religious adherence to the provincialisms of the scribe was necessary:

when the MS. has had the words divided, accented, and punctuated for the convenience of the reader, a further departure from its actual letter seems to be justifiable; nor does there seem any sufficient reason for exhibiting in the text words which had no existence in the Greek language; still less reason is there for endorsing those words with accents. It may be urged that, at least, such an arrangement has the merit of not departing from the original document; yet it must have required a large amount of editorial courage to print in the sacred text, *with accents*, such monstrosities as *ἀπῆλθθν*, Mark iii. 13; *ἔχοντθς*, Rev. v. 8; *ἐχρῶν*, Luke i. 74; *πάρκτορι*, Luke xii. 58; *κεκλητκότι*, Luke xiv. 12; *μετοξὺ*, Acts xiii. 42, *οὐχεται*, John v. 42. Surely, an editor who could be trusted to accentuate and point, might be allowed to emend, in his text, the mere blunders of the scribe, and to relegate the blunders themselves to the notes. Mr. Cowper has chosen the opposite course: it has, indeed, the merit of being faithful to the letter of the Codex; but why does he endorse with accents and breathings a collection of letters which, as a word, is a nonentity in the Greek language?

We have pointed out, with all frankness, what appear to us to be the defects in Mr. Cowper's edition of A. That it cannot be depended on as a perfectly accurate representation of the MS. has been shown in at least two instances. But we are well aware how extremely difficult it is to make a reprint which shall contain no errors; and it would be unfair not to admit the merits of the work. Mr. Cowper's edition is cheap, portable, readable; his notes are easily referred to, being numbered and placed at the bottom of the page; and they have the great merit of not being too long. To the generality of readers the text of A. has hitherto been accessible only through the medium of the Variæ lectiones given in critical editions of the New Testament: and every student is aware how difficult it is to gather the general character of the text from such disjointed evidence. By the help of Mr. Cowper's edition, a whole chapter, or an entire book, of the New Testament, as it stands in one of our oldest MSS., can now be read continuously, and the general spirit of the document can be caught before it has evaporated in the Lachmannian or Tischendorfian crucible. If Mr. Cowper's edition is not so accurate as it might be, it nevertheless enables the student to approximate pretty nearly to the truth; and the very things which are blemishes in the eyes of a scholar help to exhibit the character of the document where they occur.

The Readings in the Codex Alexandrinus are so well known, that we need not specify them in detail here. Our readers are, of course, aware that the MS. contains Mark xvi. 9—20 and

John v. 4. The leaves where John viii. 1—11 occurs have been lost; yet it has been ascertained, from counting the number of lines, that the passage from vii. 53 to viii. 11 was *not* in the MS. Acts viii. 37 is wanting. In Acts xx. 28, we read *την εκκλησιαν του κυριου*. 1 John v. 7 is, of course, wanting.

In conclusion, we may perhaps be allowed to say a few words on 1 Tim. iii. 16. Mr. Cowper here puts Θεὸς in the text. His note is as follows:—

'Nunc legitur $\overline{\Theta\varsigma}$ sed m. recens lineam supra $\overline{\Theta\varsigma}$ crassavit. Quid olim valde obscurum: nobis tenebræ sunt. Locum sæpe inspeximus, sed fugit aciem veritas.'

In his introduction, he says (p. xvii.):—

'The Θ consists of a circle tolerably well defined, and by the original scribe; but the transverse is only what may be called a mere shadow, as if a pen almost dry had touched it, and that recently.'

Now, the transverse line that first meets the eye is a short black, thick stroke, evidently by a later hand. Of this, Mr. Cowper makes no definite mention. The real question is, whether there was a transverse line by the first hand, underlying this thicker stroke (Professor Ellicott calls it 'a rude dot') by the second hand. The examination by Professor Ellicott, described in a note appended to his edition of 1 Tim. (p. 100) certainly did appear to us to have set the question at rest. We quote his words below.[1]

The following is the result of our own inspection:—The mark of contraction over the $\overline{\text{OC}}$ is clearly by a later hand; so also is a small black line put in the middle of the Θ, not running diametrically across. In the very same column, thirteen lines lower, may be seen the sacred name (nominative case) in the

[1] 'The results of my examination of the Codex Alexandrinus may be thus briefly stated. On inspecting the disputed word, there appeared (*a*) a coarse line over, and a rude dot within, the O, in *black* ink; (*b*) a faint line across O in ink of the *same colour* as the adjacent letters. It was clear that (*a*) had no claim on attention, except as being possibly a rude retouching of (*b*): the latter demanded careful examination. After inspection with a strong lens, it seemed more than probable that Wetstein's opinion (Prolegom. vol. i. p. 22) was correct. Careful measurements showed that the first ε of *ενσεβεια*, ch. vi. 3, on the other side of the page, was exactly opposite, the circular portion of the two letters nearly exactly coinciding, and the thickened extremity of the sagitta of ε being behind what had seemed a ragged portion of the left-hand inner edge of O. It remained only to *prove* the identity of this sagitta with the seeming line across O. This, with the kind assistance of Mr. Hamilton, of the British Museum, was thus effected. While one of us held up the page to the light, and viewed the O through the lens, the other brought the point of an instrument (without, of course, touching the MS.) so near to the extremity of the sagitta of the ε as to make a point of shade visible to the observer on the other side. When the point of the instrument was drawn over the sagitta of ε, the point of shade was seen *to exactly trace out the suspected diameter of the* O. It would thus seem certain that (*b*) is no part of O, and that the reading of A. is certainly *θς*.'—*Ellicott, Past. Epistles*, p. 100.

contracted form, by the first hand; and in this instance, the transverse line runs diametrically across—ϴ. At the back of the O, in 1 Tim. iii. 16, is the first letter in the word ЄTCЄBЄIAN. When the leaf is held up to the light, and looked at from the OC side, the transverse line, or sagitta, of the reversed Ɔ is distinctly seen running across the O; and it was certainly our impression, after looking for some time, that there was no other line running transversely across the O. We concluded that what might have been thought to be the original transverse line, and which distinguishes the Θ from the O, was simply the mark from the Є on the other side.

There is a peculiarity to be remarked in the sagitta of the Є: it ends in a slightly upturned bulb. This little upturned bulb is distinctly visible on its own side, and is, as we have been told, also visible on the obverse side with a strong light. The morning, however, was not light enough for us to verify this. But if it can be made out that the faint line running across the O is a ⌙, not a —, then clearly it must be the sagitta of the Є on the obverse side.[1]

An instance of an epsilon sagitta, turning what was meant to be an O into an apparent Θ, may be found in this very MS., Mark iii. 13 (Section $\overset{\text{KΘ}}{\text{B}}$). Here the first hand wrote AΠHΛOЄN. The second hand completed the circle of the Є, meaning to correct the word into AΠHΛΘON. But the sagitta of the Є remaining, the text exhibits AΠHΛΘΘN.

Further, let it be considered that in that one column where the disputed reading occurs, there are five other instances where the sacred name is found, written (as usual) in the abbreviated form. Some more instances occur in the other three columns which make up the two open pages. We ask, Is there, in any one of these instances, a doubt that the transverse line in the Θ, and the superwritten line of the $\overline{\text{ΘC}}$, were by the *prima manus*? In each case, in that very column, the Θ is perfectly clear.[2] If, then, in the disputed passage, the *prima manus* had written Θ, why should not that have remained as clear as the other instances in the same column are to this hour? Why should the second hand have retouched the Θ in this case, and in this case only? Is it at all likely that ΘC would have been altered into

[1] That letters are faintly traceable on the obverse side, through the parchment, may be seen in a beautiful photograph of a few lines of the Vatican MS. belonging to the Rev. J. W. Burgon, Fellow of Oriel College, and most kindly lent us by him on more than one occasion. Our readers will, of course, remember his interesting letters in the *Guardian* newspaper. In this specimen we have traced (reading of course from right to left) in John xxi. 18, NATO ƆΘΛƎΘ: in 19, OTTOT: and ΩTANAΘΩIOΠ.

[2] In the disputed passage Woide prints ϴ: in the other instances Θ.

OC? Is it not much more likely that OC should be altered into ΘC, especially if the faint shadow mark from the obverse ϑ gave an idea that the O was meant for Θ? That the OC was likely to be altered into $\overline{\Theta C}$ does not rest on mere conjecture. In the Ephraem rescript, the probability is that the first hand wrote OC. At all events, it is certain that the present transverse line, which makes the O into a Θ, was put in by the third hand, whose country was Constantinople, whose date is the ninth century.

Again, in the Codex Sinaiticus, the first hand wrote OC, on which reading Professor Tischendorf notes:—

'Corrector aliquis, qui omnium ultimus textum attigit sæculi fere duodecimi, reposuit Θεος, sed hoc tam caute fecit, ut antiquissimam scripturam intactam relinqueret.'

We have therefore fair ground for inferring that the Codex Alexandrinus fared like its brethren, the Codex Sinaiticus and the Codex Ephraemi rescriptus. The original reading was OC. Later correctors, sensible of the difficulty of the reading, removed the difficulty by altering the word.

With regard to the general character of the text, it may suffice, on the present occasion, to say, that, in the Gospels, Scholz considers the text of A. to agree mainly with the Alexandrine family of MSS. In the rest of the New Testament he calls it κορυφαῖος. Dr. Tregelles thinks that A. 'in many respects, holds a middle place' between the Alexandrine and the Constantinopolitan families in the Gospels.

As reference has been made to the ancient divisions of the books of the New Testament, we subjoin a short account of them.

Ammonius of Alexandria divided each Gospel into consecutive sections, with a view of enabling the reader to refer to parallel passages: of these there are in Mt. 355, Mk. 233, L. 342, J. 232. This division was made towards the end of the third century.

In the early part of the fourth century, *Eusebius* (d. 340), Bishop of Cæsarea, classified these sections in ten tables, called the 'Canons of Eusebius.'

These sections were generally adopted by the MSS. from about the middle of the fourth century, being (sometimes with the canons sometimes without) placed at the margin.

At a later period (postero tempore, Scholz), the Gospels were divided into longer sections, called κεφάλαια or τίτλοι. Of these there are in Mt. 68, Mk. 48, L. 83, J. 18. In A. they are prefixed to the Gospels, and are also given at the top of the page.[1]

[1] A list of them is appended to the second part (recently issued) of Dr. Tregelles' edition of the New Testament.

It is uncertain who was the author of the division of the Pauline epistles: of these there are in Rom. 19, 1 C. 9, 2 C. 11, G. 12, E. 10, P. 7, C. 10, 1 Th. 7, 2 Th. 6, H. 21, 1 T. 18, 2 T. 9, Tit. 6, Philem. 2.

These sections are, however, known by the name of *Euthalian*, as Euthalius, deacon of Alexandria, afterwards Bishop of Sulca, seems to be the first who published them (A. D. 458). And he afterwards (about A. D. 490) put forth a divided edition for the Acts and Cath. Epp. Of these there are in Acts 40, Jam. 6, 1 P. 8, 2 P. 4, 1 Jo. 7, 2 Jo. 1, 3 Jo. 1, Jude 4.

These divisions seem to have existed before; the division of Acts being attributed to Pamphilus Martyr.

The Apocalypse was divided into twenty-four λόγοι and into seventy-two κεφάλαια; the work is attributed to *Andreas* of Cæsarea, in Cappadocia, 'seculo quinto ad finem vugente.' The λόγοι answered to the Euthalian divisions.

It does not seem quite clearly ascertained when the practice of larger initial letters commenced: they are not in the Codex Vaticanus, the Codex Sinaiticus, or the fragments of the Octateuch at Paris, Leyden, and S. Petersburgh: but they may be seen in a fragment of Dioscorides at Vienna, to which the date assigned in Silvestre is A.D. 375. They are found in the Codex Alexandrinus and in the Ephraem rescript. In A. the Psalms, the fourteen appended hymns, the books of Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, the Song, the Wisdom of Solomon, the Wisdom of Jesus son of Sirach, are written stichometrically. A similar arrangement is found in the Codex Sinaiticus, with regard to these which have been called the βίβλοι στιχηρεῖς.

ART. VII.—*The Papal Sovereignty: viewed in its relations to the Catholic Religion, and the Law of Europe. Translated from the French of* MGR. DUPANLOUP, *Bishop of Orleans.* London: Dolman.

THE present critical state of the Head of the Roman Catholic Church, is one which is exciting the very deepest interest throughout the whole of Europe; it affects directly every branch of that Church, and indirectly may much affect our own. No one can shut his eyes to the fact that the temporal dominions of the Pope are on the eve of being lost; the revolutionary wave is already in motion, which seems destined to burst upon the very patrimony of S. Peter, and sweep away the last remnant of earthly power, which has so long belonged to the Patriarch of the West, as it has swallowed up the Northern Duchies, and the Kingdom of Naples. What is to become of the Head of Roman Catholic Christendom, is a problem which the boldest politicians can scarcely conjecture. There was once a seventy years' exile at Avignon, which Roman historians have called the seventy years' captivity; may we draw further the analogy and say, there may be also a final dispersion? We do not however intend to indulge in prophecies of what may happen; we purpose rather to speak of that state of things which actually exists, and which has brought the Papacy to its present condition. In doing this we intend to draw our materials entirely from Roman Catholic sources; nor could we wish for any better authorities in order to exhibit clearly the present critical state of the spiritual, as well as the temporal, power of the Pope.

We are, of course, perfectly aware of the distinction so much insisted upon by the Gallican divines, between the Church of Rome, and the Court of Rome; but while we most fully admit the distinction, we must still bear in mind that the Ultramontane writers have always insisted that it is absolutely necessary for the maintenance of his supremacy, that the Pope should be a temporal prince;[1] all agree in declaring the necessity of his

[1] The following is the language of Mgr. Gerbet, Bishop of Perpignan: 'What! 'the temporal sovereignty of the Pope, instituted to insure the liberty of his 'universal mission, is not a religious question! The violation of the faith sworn 'to him, of the oaths of fidelity made to him, not a religious question! The excom-'munication pronounced by the last general council, the Council of Trent, against 'all who violate the ecclesiastical dominions, not a religious question! The 'demonstrations of impiety stirred up by the chiefs of the spoliating faction wherever 'their footsteps pass, are not religious questions! In its causes, in its immediate 'effects, and its future consequences, the present state of affairs vitally involves 'the very highest interests of religion!'

temporal as well as spiritual independence on any European power. To be Head of the Roman Catholic Church, he must not be merely Archbishop of a city, which, in its temporal and political capacity, owns the supremacy of a French or German emperor, or of a king of Italy; he must not be shackled, as the Patriarch of Constantinople, or the Archbishop of Canterbury, with allegiance to any earthly monarch; 'Rome and a garden' in the midst of an Italian kingdom might in name be independent, but could not be so in reality; if independent, it could not be any part of the Italian kingdom:—

'In vain do the Italians, or revolutionary pamphlets, say the Pope might remain at Rome, and inhabit the palace and basilica of S. John Lateran, as under Constantine: he might be both mere bishop of Rome and head of Catholicity: spiritually, he would reign; as to temporals, the Roman authorities would supply them to him. I have already said what I think of this absurd and odious hypocrisy. No; this could never be. You, yourselves, would soon find it impossible. If you are serious in proposing such a dream, I tell you it will soon be dissipated. The Pope, the supreme chief of Catholicity, the universal Pontiff, at S. John Lateran! Whoever you are, senator, consul, municipal authorities, ruler under whatever title, you could not remain one day beside him. He would be to you an unceasing cause of umbrage and difficulty. The Pope would be too great for you; the weight of his dignity would crush you in spite of him, in spite of yourselves; you could not suffer him; you would soon hide yourselves in despair and shame.'—Pp. 115, 116.

There cannot be the slightest doubt that, to retain the position which the Papacy acquired in the Middle Ages, temporal as well as spiritual independence is absolutely necessary. But it seems equally evident to us that that independence is gone, and utterly impossible to be recovered. The fact of the presence of a French army at Rome is itself destructive to that position, not only as being in itself an acknowledgment of foreign domination, but, because it is that alone which preserves the shadow of temporal power; remove the French army, and the Pope's government would not stand for a single day. Already, if we may trust Italian newspapers, universal suffrage has voted the annexation of the Papal States to the newly-formed Italian kingdom, and, as if to make the assumed right of independence more hostile to the Pope, more distasteful to the Head of the Roman Catholic Church, the man, whom the subjects of the Pope have thus chosen for their king, is one excommunicated by that sovereign in his spiritual capacity.

Now, had this been the work of a foreign heretical power, had Italy been conquered by some nation of a religion hostile to the Roman Catholic; and had such universal suffrage been gathered under the muzzle of loaded rifles, and at the point of fixed bayonets, we should have understood the case, and excused the act,—the Church, as well as the people, must for the time

have suffered the hard necessity of coercion; but when we find that the votes for the annexation were taken secretly, for fear of the Government in power, as they have been in Rome, we can come to no other conclusion than that the Papal Government has not only rendered itself unpopular, but even detested. Again, when the Head of the Government is also Head of the Church, and when the spiritual and the temporal are so mixed up together, that invasion of the latter is visited on the offender by the spiritual penalty of excommunication, and we see that excommunication disregarded by the people, we can come to no other conclusion than that faith in the spiritual claims of the Pope has altogether departed from the Italian character. But, perhaps, some one will object, It is not fair to judge of the whole people by these revolutionists; they are but a few firebrands, who keep the whole country in a ferment,—the people, the Church, is faithful yet. Let us see what a Roman Catholic writer says:—

'The names and the number of those who have suffered persecution in their heroic resistance to the revolution, would form in themselves a noble array; but yet can we in fairness state, that the revolution going on in every corner of Italy, has not received, not only more open countenance and support, but a much larger undercurrent of favour than we like to acknowledge, and met a much less real resistance than we had a right to expect from Catholic Italy? . . . . In the outset an objection might, perhaps, be fairly started against the likelihood that the inhabitants of Catholic Italy, to the number of twenty-two millions, should take part—to confine ourselves to the gravest sin in the present revolution—against the temporal rights of the Holy See, and should lavish their loyalty, affection, and obedience, on its arch-enemy, unless they were able to show an apparent justification for their lawless acts, or some deep unendurable provocation to rebellion. If this, indeed, were so: if the objection were correct, it would, indeed, be strange, that Italy, weakened by no corrupting heresy, by no internal dissension in matters of faith, should by her cry of annexation, prefer to the rule of the Father of Christendom, the sway of an excommunicated king, the puppet of France, in the States of the Church.'—*Dublin Review*, Nov. 1860, pp. 134, 135.

All this, indeed, would be quite unaccountable, were it, as we have been always told, that the Papal Government is the most just, the most wise, the most paternal: what footing could revolutionists have in a country where every one had his rights, and was allowed to exercise them, as must be in a truly paternal government? Hear what the Dublin Reviewer says in the next page:—

'Without organization or freedom of speech, or the right of association, what resistance can the nobles, the natural leaders of the people, offer? They, or at least those among them who are not yet pseudo-liberals, like many of the nobility of Lombardy, or of the Romagnas, or Erastians, like most of those in Tuscany, or profligate, like too many in Naples, must remain idle spectators, if not the victims, of a lawless persecution. . . . . They have beheld

the boldest of their bishops dragged, like the noble Cardinal Archbishop of Pisa, to prison, or, like the Cardinal Archbishop of Naples, driven into exile; they have seen the glorious Company of Jesus fall the first victim to the wrath of the infidel, their houses seized, their property confiscated, their lives in danger. Nothing is too sacred, nothing too weak, nothing too dear to the hearts of the people, for the vengeance of the Revolution.'—*Ibid.* pp. 136, 137.

The writer makes an attempt to explain from whence arose this violent spirit of revolution. He speaks of a certain 'Bonapartism,' a great revolutionary spirit evoked by the French Revolution, and still exercising an influence all over Europe: but, surely, such a spirit ought not to be found in the States of the Church; and if it existed in 1848, it ought to have been appeased by a paternal government in twelve years. There was, no doubt, great discontent in our own country during the ten years previous to the period of the continental revolution, and for some time after; there were persons then who would gladly have seen acted in London the scenes that rendered Paris infamous, with its barricades stained with an Archbishop's blood. Now all this is past; a judicious re-arrangement of the taxation of the country has not only enabled Government to keep the people contented, but to increase to such an immense extent the trade and prosperity of the empire, that a revenue can with ease be raised, which would then have been thought only possible in time of war, and certain to create a large amount of suffering. So little is there of complaint, that the most democratic of our senators declares, that he cannot find sufficient discontent to make the people anxious for an extension of the suffrage.

But again: who are these revolutionists? From the description of the Dublin Reviewer we should imagine that they were a band of some hostile foreign nation, who have been introducing and importing their poisonous and blasphemous principles, and corrupting and rendering discontented the peaceful, quiet, contented natives; who have invaded an unwilling people, and, like the Turk or the Saracen, have made the Church their object of hatred, bishops their victims, and monasteries their prey. History, however, comes to our aid, and tells us that these revolutionists are among the noblest and best educated in Italy; that they are everywhere popular, supported by all classes: that the confiscation of ecclesiastical property, however unjust, nay, impolitic, it may be, is viewed by native Catholics with indifference, if not with approval. Could Garibaldi, *e.g.* have revolutionised the kingdom of Naples with his two thousand followers, had the whole Sicilian people been contented with their ruler and averse to revolution? Could he have compelled Palermo, a strong fortress, defended by twenty-five thousand soldiers and a fleet, to surrender, had not the sympathies of the whole native

population, and perhaps of many of the garrison, been with his cause? Had Italy, as we before said, been ravaged and overrun by some foreign heretical power, whose chief aim seemed to be the destruction of the faith and religion of the people, the dispersion and imprisonment of their ecclesiastics, the destruction of their religious houses, we could have understood his language and sympathise with it; but when we find that these revolutionists are both natives and Catholics, we confess ourselves at a loss to comprehend the position of the Dublin Reviewer. According to him, the majority of these revolutionists are Catholics, only a very few infidels, and all Italians.

'The infidel party on the other hand is small, but it makes up for the fewness of its numbers, by the surprising activity of its members, and in the virulence of its hatred against religion. Italian infidelity is in its first vigour, and possesses all the headstrong impetuosity of youth; unlike the infidel of France, the Italian infidel is seldom known to seek a death-bed repentance, or a final reconciliation. The secret societies are its head-quarters, and the chief agency for the propagation of its views. The members of these societies, bound by a fearful oath, and by terrible penalties, are ready to obey all the behests imposed upon them, even to the work of midnight assassinaton, of sacrilege and king-murder. The manner in which the ranks of these societies are recruited, and how they gradually draw into their fellowship the able and active-minded men, who are not enlisted under the banner of the party of order, are curious illustrations of the ill effect produced by a long continued repressive system of government. Deprived of the right of public discussion, of the freedom of the press, men of all ranks, the noble, tinged with a false liberalism, the man of letters, the professional man, all, in a word, who have a grievance to complain of, or have suffered an injustice, nurse their petty wrongs in secret, until they can no longer endure the unnatural restraint, and seek relief in the forbidden societies. Here they find full expression for their real or imaginary wrongs; uninitiated at first in their darker mysteries (*nemo repente turpissimus*), they are only gradually allured, step by step, until at last, often to their horror, they find themselves entangled in fatal meshes from which there is no escape . . . . . A knot of these revolutionists by profession is to be found in every city in Italy.'—*Ibid.* pp. 137, 138.

Surely the power and influence of a numerous episcopate and priesthood should be able to stem this torrent; armed, as the Church is, with the weapon of excommunication, which it is able and ready to hurl against political offenders, as well as ecclesiastical, how comes it that the flock are indifferent to the shepherd's voice, and are found banding themselves with infidels and revolutionists, both in secret societies and in open rebellion? Alas! we can only give one answer; the shepherd is as unfaithful as his flock, and not only stretches forth no hand to stay, opens no mouth to check, the cause of revolution, but, sympathising with the rebels, he encourages the leaders, and sings 'Te Deums' at their victories.

'Either from the indolence natural to the Southern character, or from ignorance of its fatal consequences, how many priests are there not to be found, who

use all the influence which their sacred calling confers, to let the evil of a victorious Revolution take its course, undisturbed and unrebuked? How many pastorals from the bishops do we miss? Where are the dignified episcopal rebukes against usurpation, church robbery, and sacrilege, which from every see that is not yet vacant or violated, should issue in rapid succession? Why are monasteries plundered with impunity, Jesuits banished without trial, nuns driven from their convents by the bayonets of the soldiery, but because too many Catholic men and women in this beautiful, enervating Italy, too many monks, and priests, and bishops, are too timid, too unheroic and martyrlike, or too blind to the ulterior results of the movement, to rise up with one voice before the evil-doer, and declare that this lawless and godless Revolution must come to an end?'

In a note in the above passage we read,—

'In the Neapolitan States alone there are about eighty-seven bishops, mitred abbots, and arch-priests; and but few of these dignitaries of the Church have protested against the usurpations of the excommunicated King of Sardinia.'—*Ibid.* p. 140.

Here it is confessed that a large majority of the episcopate and priesthood are in favour of that Revolution, which is to set a man, excommunicated of the Pope, on the *débris* of the shattered thrones of Italian monarchs.[1] Are we not justified in concluding further, that they would not oppose, if they did not absolutely assist, the annexation of the States of the Church to the Italian Kingdom? Can we suppose that they have any faith left in the Papacy when we see that they prefer an excommunicated King to the Father of Roman Christendom? And this indifference is shared by other Roman Catholic nations as well; in fact, the only power that seemed at all likely to interfere with the Italian Revolution was one alien in religion, the Greek Empire of Russia:—

'The whole of Christendom is concerned in the quarrel; for has not Napoleon smitten the Pope in the face? The king among kings is hemmed in on all sides by the emissaries of the Revolution, and the men of blood, and there is none to help him. Not a nation has sent an army to his rescue. Not a king has spared a regiment for his service. Of all the armed rulers in Europe, not one has drawn the sword in his behalf. The cowardice of the kings is only

[1] We have made enquiry how it is that the Italian priesthood were found so universally on the side of revolution, and we received for answer that there had never been carried out in that country the ordinance of the Council of Trent, for establishing colleges and seminaries for the education of the priesthood. The fact is one disgraceful to the Pope and the Italian hierarchy: if it has been done in France under very disadvantageous circumstances, why has it been neglected in Italy? Every one who has travelled abroad, well knows the great difference between the French clergy and those of other nations, and will understand the advantage of the system of colleges which obtains in the former country. But may we not ask, Why have not the monasteries in Italy been changed, as they might have been, into seminaries? There were enough of endowments for such a purpose. Had this been so, we should probably not have heard of the ruin of so many religious houses, and the confiscation of their property. Had they advanced with the age, and reformed themselves to meet the wants of the age, they might have continued to this day.

equalled by the apathy of the peoples. . . . . Europe gazes at the issue of the fearful struggle with a fixed and stolid eye, like that of a sleep-walker.'—*Ibid.* p. 127.

The different tone now adopted towards Louis-Napoleon is one of the first things that strikes us. He who so lately was 'The Eldest Son of the Church,' whose progresses through his dominions was everywhere greeted with every honour that the ecclesiastics could bestow—some would call it disgusting adulation and flattery—is now the object of the bitterest invective from the ultra-Papal party. Verily the advice of the Psalmist should have been listened to before, 'Put not your trust in princes.' We suppose that the French Emperor shares in the excommunication launched against those who assisted in despoiling the Holy See of the Romagna; the sentence certainly sits as lightly on him as on the King of Sardinia. We say we suppose, for really there is no arriving at correct information as to the persons intended. Of old, the Head of the Church did not hesitate to designate the guilty leaders by name, and leave no doubt as to his meaning; in those days an emperor might be seen craving absolution and reconciliation on his bended knees before the Pope's gate: now, emperors and kings treat the sentence of the Head of Roman Christendom with silent contempt. The days of its terror are passed. The very fact that no names were mentioned in the excommunication is a clear intimation that the Pope knew this when he uttered it: better, surely, have never published such a fearful sentence—as, rightly given for sufficient reasons, such a sentence is—than to send it forth only to be received with contempt and neglect. We have made inquiry, and have been informed, in quarters where these things are understood, how the French Emperor and the King of Sardinia are to be officially informed whether they are included in the sentence or not; it is left to the private confessor. This only makes the whole sentence worthless, if not quite as ridiculous as *Punch's* caricature represented it. Is Louis-Napoleon, who knows nothing but his own will, likely to choose for his confessor a priest who will tell him that he is excommunicated, and refuse him the sacrament? Is the King of Sardinia not able to select from the many hundred priests, who have hailed the Revolution with joy, and headed their flocks to vote for annexation, one for a confessor, who not only would not care to tell the King the truth, but who actually does not believe himself that the King has committed an act worthy of excommunication? Those who sang 'Te Deums' for the success of his arms are not likely to refuse him the communion of the Church. Can we, then, believe any otherwise than that every-

thing like faith in the peculiar claims of the Papacy is gone? Bishops and priests tell us by their actions that they do not believe in them; emperors and kings treat them with contempt; the Catholic laity shows the greatest indifference to them; nay, to use the words of the Dublin Reviewer before quoted, they 'prefer to the rule of the Father of Christendom, the sway of an 'excommunicated King, in the very States of the Church.'

Do not let our readers think that we are exulting in this humbling of the Papacy; that we should rejoice to see a still deeper fall. We disclaim all such thoughts. That we should rejoice if we saw the Pope lay aside what we conscientiously believe to be an assumption of power unwarranted by Scripture, still more if we saw a real reformation go through the whole Church, we have no hesitation in declaring. We should be untrue to our own Church if we did not. What we wish to point out is this, that the claim to exercise, and the actual exercising of powers which we think do not, by any divine right, belong to the Patriarchate, has brought the Pope into his present deplorable position. When Hildebrand and Innocent III. set up their claims to control the kings of Europe, they did so at a time when such power was believed in, and such claims respected; and in lawless times, when kings were not controlled by parliaments, and nobles by public opinion, the exercise of such power and such claims was often of real benefit to Christendom. With advancing civilisation, with the full exercise of justice and international law, this claim should have ceased, as being no longer required, or, at any rate, no longer heeded. The continuance of such claims is now a mistake—a fatal mistake; for if such claims remain unheeded and disputed, will not all faith, even in power and authority really belonging to the Bishop of Rome, be unheeded and despised too? If the sentence of excommunication against the two monarchs and their advisers be practically disregarded, will not the people generally consider all sentences equally worthless? We all know that a like sentence of excommunication was once delivered against a monarch of this kingdom, and that her dominions were given to another. That sentence was followed by a fitting out of one of the most stupendous armaments that the world had then seen. There was in those days a belief in the authority both to give and take away kingdoms by Christ's Vicar, and in the right to act upon it. Does any one believe in such now? Would any one of the Catholic monarchs or Catholic nations act upon such a sentence? Would any other Catholic monarch and Catholic people allow it to be done? As we said before, the time for such is gone, for the belief of Catholics in such power exists no longer.

Let us not be misunderstood. We are not saying that faith should change with the age, and that what was true at one time can be untrue at another; or that the unbelief of the age makes the word of God of none effect. What we do say is this, that the Pope never had divine authority for this sort of interference with the temporal concerns of the European kingdoms, and therefore his claim rested merely on the consent of Christendom. Once let that consent be broken, and the assumed right falls with it. His sentence becomes mere *brutum fulmen;* itself despised, and he that uttered it.

Again, what a sight it will be before Roman Catholic Christendom, if the subjects of the Pope's temporal dominions throw off the Papal Government, and annex themselves to the already-formed Kingdom of Italy! What is the Pope to do? Is he to leave Rome, and set up his temporal throne somewhere else? In the opinion of Ultramontanes such a course would be spiritual suicide. 'Europe without the Papacy 'would be revolution in religion and society. It would probably 'be the final doom of the European continent; . . . . . and for 'my part, I have always thought, that if God one day were to 'determine to curse Europe, and to pour out upon us the most 'terrible of His judgments—that is, to take from us the light 'of faith and civilisation—He would begin by taking away from 'us the Papacy, and transporting it elsewhere' (p. 137). Yet what alternative remains but that of removing his throne, or becoming the Primate of the new Italian Kingdom? In the latter case he must enter into a concordat with an excommunicated king, and he must absolve an excommunicated episcopate and priesthood; for all those ecclesiastics who acknowledge Victor Emmanuel as their king, share in his excommunication. This last would be a bitter draught indeed, and would by itself seal the deed of abdication of the Vicar of Christ. It would make him who so long claimed to be the king of earthly kings, the arbiter of nations, a subject of the temporal power; an inferior to an European monarch.

It is not only in the Italian Kingdom that the claims of the Papacy are thus despised; the ecclesiastical history of Austria, during the greater part of the present century, is one of the most sickening that an Ultramontane can look upon. The Church had become the mere creation of the State; the bishops, nominated by the crown, showed that they well understood where the chief authority lay, and how they should respect it. When Prince Metternich proposed a concordat between Austria and the Pope, the Archbishop of Vienna objected to its terms, as interfering with the rights of the crown. 'Sire,' said he, 'by that concordat you sacrifice your imperial rights;' and then,

as the Dublin Reviewer remarks, 'Metternich's proposal was 'dismissed with a rebuke to himself, for being much more papal 'than his bishop.' Dr. Wolff, in the history of his early life, gives us a similar picture of the courtly prelates, covered with ribbons and orders, the price of their subservience to the crown, parading the ensigns of their slavery before the world of Vienna. We shall quote the Dublin Reviewer, who draws a not over-coloured picture of the abject state to which Josephism reduced the Church; never, in the worst days of the last century, was the Church of England ever brought so low as was the Church of Austria in our own time. Let us see it as described:—

'The Church was nearly cut off from communication with the Holy See; it was forbidden to meet in synod, or to pass regulations for its own internal management. Most of the religious orders were suppressed, and the number of ecclesiastical students in the seminaries was limited by the express enactments of the State. The bishops were not allowed to address the flocks entrusted to their charge without permission from the Government.

The episcopate, nominated by the crown, soon became the subservient tool in the hands of the temporal power, and showed an invariable hostility and resistance to the Holy See. The canons and higher clergy, largely infected with the evil tendencies of the age, and enjoying the gifts of the State, spent their lives in luxurious ease, and bestowed but little consideration upon the duties of their sacred calling. With the departure of the ecclesiastical spirit, and in the absence of episcopal discipline, concubinage increased among the clergy to a lamentable extent.'—*Dublin Review*, p. 111.

Here, indeed, are ecclesiastics fettered in a manner utterly incompatible with all the principles of the Roman Church; and what makes the picture sadder, with the full consent of the bishops and clergy; the Church not allowed to meet to deliberate on its own proper affairs; the very dearest privilege, that of appeal to the Head of the Church, forbidden—a privilege, to enjoy which, in olden time, bishops were ready to go to prison and to death. Here, in the nineteenth century, is not only a silent acquiescence, but a glorying in the chains that bound them.

In France, at this day, the imperial power commits acts of tyranny toward the Church, to which the celebrated Hampden case of our own Church is a mere bagatelle. At this moment there are six bishoprics vacant; and such is the restraint practised on those that are full, that no bishop is allowed to publish his charge, until it is submitted to the inspection of the Minister of State. We need hardly remind our readers, that the Church in France possesses no property, each bishop and curé is paid by the State; the old endowments having been long ago confiscated by the Government. A strange story oozes out that on the death of a late bishop there was found among his papers a scheme for reviving the idea of the Gallican Church of the early part of the eighteenth century, when it opposed the Bull *Unigenitus*, of a separate patriarchate: a scheme perfectly com-

patible with the Emperor's policy—to make France supreme in everything, both in political and ecclesiastical matters.

It is in Algier, however, that imperial tyranny in purely spiritual matters is most glaring. For that beautiful country, once the home of S. Augustine, and of hundreds of Catholic Bishops, there is but one Bishop from the borders of Tunis to those of Morocco.[1] There are three million natives who pay an unwilling allegiance to the French Emperor. Of these there are descendants of the ancient Mauritanians, now called Kabaïl and Berbers, and those of the Arab conquerors of the sixth century; intermixed with the latter, included under the common name of Arab, may be seen the fair skin and light hair of the descendant of the Vandal colonist, besides large numbers of imported negroes; all these are really or nominally Mohammedan. What a fair field, any one would say, for the Church to missionize, and recover to the Catholic faith the lost of twelve centuries! Alas! the cold, stern, imperial decree comes in, forbidding even attempts at conversion, not only in the native troops, but of any of the natives in any part, in the city, in the country, in the mountain, or in the desert. We thought our early history of the British rule in India was sad enough in this respect, but it never arrived at such a pitch as to prohibit all missionary exertion.

Stepping over the Pyrenees from France into Spain, we see the most Catholic country in Europe despoiled of some of the outward signs of the Roman Catholic Church; its monasteries and religious houses suppressed; the buildings, and even chapels, given over as a prey to the spoiler, who, at his own will, took away the beautiful marbles and monuments of the sanctuary; all ecclesiastical property confiscated; much of it sold, only a small portion retained, and a few religious houses permitted to exist; and the clergy made mere stipendiaries of the State. All this the work of his most Catholic Majesty, and the most Catholic Cortes, and in a country where religious liberty is unknown.

If we cross over into Italy the like work is going on: there, too, are religious establishments being broken up, and the endowments made public property. All this done by Catholic kings, Catholic parliaments, and, as far as we can see, with the

[1] Let us speak with all possible respect of Mgr. Pavy, Bishop of Algier; no one has done more, perhaps no one could do more to maintain the dignity of the Church, and respect for religion and morality, than he has done in Algier. With a population the most licentious, the very offscouring of France, men of broken character, as well as broken fortune, he has raised the tone of religion, and established a reverence for its ordinances, such as few could have done. The Sunday congregation that assembles in the cathedral contains more men than will be seen in any churches in France, south of Lyon; and quite as many women, in proportion to the population. It is not his fault that there are no missions to the Mohammedans.

full consent of the Catholic public. The only conclusion that we can draw from these facts is, that states now consult what they think the advantage of their country, and care nothing for the remonstrances, nay, the denunciations, of the Vicar of Christ. If a concordat can be entered into *after* the acts are done, as was the case in Spain in 1851, it is well; it gives further authority to the acts of spoliation and plunder: if not, the deed is done, and cannot be undone. Such will probably be the end of the *bouleversement* that has taken place in Italy after a few years of protest and remonstrance on the part of the Holy See.

There is one feature in the policy of Rome in her dealings with foreign nations that deserves particular attention. It is this: that for a long time she has given her entire support to the Liberal party— we might call this party even by a stronger name, and say the revolutionary party, for such it has been in some countries. In Great Britain, and more markedly in Ireland, the whole support of the Roman Catholic body has ever been on the side of the Radicals: the great Irish champion of the Romanists, Daniel O'Connell, who was convicted of sedition and was only saved from imprisonment for life through the leniency of the Government, is too fresh in our memories to need more than the mention of his name to prove our assertion. In other countries—except Italy—the Jesuits seem invariably to have tried to recover their influence by contracting an alliance with the advocates of progress; in Austria, in France, in Belgium, as well as in Great Britain and Ireland, this policy was everywhere manifest. For the time it seemed to be the true one, for it opposed its great enemies—Bonapartism and Josephism; but it was, in reality, a false alliance, which never could be permanent. The Papacy is essentially an aristocratic institution; its monarchical claims, its aristocratic hierarchy, can never make it otherwise; such it always is, and must always appear, even in a republican state. We cannot conceive the Roman Church, with its hierarchy exercising their privileges, being the established religion of a republic.[1] We say, then, that this union between Popery and Liberalism is a false one, and, in the end, like all political expedients not founded on the eternal

[1] It might seem at first sight that the republics of Central and South America, which are intensely Romish in faith, are a living contradiction to our assertion. A little examination, however, will show that they do but strengthen our position; for if any one pays the least attention to the revolutions perpetually going on in them, he will find that they are really, in a very great measure, caused by the existence of this hierarchical Church; there is the popular party, and the priests' party; and the two are ever at war with each other; evidently experiencing the entire incompatibility of the two institutions. While we are writing, we read that the Archbishop of Mexico and the bishops have been expelled from that country, and obliged to seek shelter in New Orleans, and all ecclesiastical property has been confiscated.

principles of truth, will recoil on its projectors; it must bring down the Church—as an ecclesiastical institution—to the level of the political party with which it allies itself, when that party comes into power; or, if the Church refuses this humiliating position, it must turn round, and become, politically, an aristocratic opposition. Already are the Roman Catholics of Great Britain and Ireland finding that they can cooperate no longer with the Liberals; already are they turning their eyes towards Lord Derby, and the Conservatives, as a party more congenial to their feelings, and more consistent with their principles.

In Italy indeed the case has been wholly different, there it has ever allied itself with despotism; for it had to oppose the progress of Liberal principles in Piedmont, where, according to Mgr. Dupanloup, 'thirty-five religious orders were proscribed, 'seven thousand eight hundred and fifty religious were de-'prived of their property.' We all remember that rebellion and flight from Rome were the result of the present Pope's attempted reform in his own territories, and that it was only by foreign arms that he was replaced on his temporal throne. The progress of Liberal opinions is, however, inevitable; and, in the very nature of things, must extend to the whole of Italy; if not peaceably granted by the governing powers, will be wrenched from them, as we see now, by the power of the sword.

We do not sympathise with rebellion; but rebellions may be permitted by God, and apparently legitimate right forbidden to be exercised. Jeroboam rebelled against his lawful king, and set up a rival monarchy to that of the divinely appointed line of David; and the rebel's name is handed down on the record of Sacred Writ as the 'man that made Israel to sin,' but it is equally recorded that the legitimate monarch was forbidden to seek by force of arms to bring back the revolted tribes to their allegiance. Now we are told in the same pages that the ostensible cause for that revolt was the tyranny and oppression of the legitimate king; —may we not gather from hence that kings have their duties toward their subjects, as well as subjects toward their kings—that there is no 'right divine to govern wrong'? Our Catechism rightly puts the duty of subjects to their monarchs in the analogy of children to their parents, and adapts the Fifth Commandment to both. In the New Law we are told our duty to our rulers, even though those rulers may be heathen and persecutors; it is true S. Paul does not lay down the duties of the ruler to the ruled, it had been strange if he had when we consider the relative positions between the Church of Rome, to which he was writing, and the Roman emperor of that time. He does, however, say something of the duties of parents to their children, for that came under his direction as a bishop

and apostle of the Church of Christ; and so in the same chapter that he says, 'Children, obey your parents in the Lord, for this is right,' he goes on to add, 'and ye, fathers, provoke not your children to wrath.' Following out this analogy, we must conclude that there is a similar limit to a monarch's authority, as to a parent's; and if this is violated, subjects as well as children have the right of redress. No parent can justly order his child to do wrong, no child breaks the Fifth Commandment who refuses to do wrong at a parent's bidding. Nay more, if a parent says to his child, 'You are now old enough to act for 'yourself, I will therefore make you to a certain extent in-'dependent of me, saving only your proper duty; I will give 'you a certain allowance charged upon my estate, which shall 'be yours for ever;' and if he solemnly assigns this allowance to his child by a deed signed and sealed, he has no right to cancel that deed at any future time—should he do so his child has a right to claim the protection of the law, and no one will say that he is an undutiful son for so doing. Equally so must there be rights of subjects too. If a king grants his subjects a constitution, he has no right to recal his grant at any future time; if he does so his subjects have a right to resist. And this, we say, is the case with the kingdom of Naples, especially in the island of Sicily. In 1815, when King Ferdinand was restored to the throne of Southern Italy, chiefly through the instrumentality of British arms, he solemnly promised a constitution to his subjects; no sooner was he secure on the throne than he broke his word. Sicily had early been formed into a constitutional monarchy by its Norman conquerors,—it had continued so under both Suabian and Aragonese monarchs,—when united to Naples its constitution still continued. This constitution was reformed, under British influence, somewhat on the model of the British Parliament, in 1812. When Ferdinand was firmly settled on the throne of the Two Sicilies in 1815, he violated all his oaths and engagements; he abolished a constitution to which the people had the prescriptive right of centuries' duration. Sicily rose in rebellion in 1820, and demanded a restitution of her ancient privileges,—her cry was silenced by the roar of Austrian musketry. In 1848, the year of revolutions, the Sicilians again took arms to claim their forfeited rights, and again was a constitution given by the king;[1]

[1] The following is the terrible oath taken by the late king in ratifying the Constitution of 1848, as read by Mr. Gladstone in the House of Commons, March 7:—'In the awful name of the Most Holy and Almighty God, the Trinity in Unity, to whom alone it appertains to read the depths of the heart, and whom we loudly invoke as the Judge of the simplicity of our intentions, and of the unreserved sincerity with which we have determined to enter upon the paths of the new political,

and again, after Lord Minto's unsuccessful mission, did the treacherous monarch break his promise, and re-establish arbitrary rule.

Sicily had something to demand, an old long-standing right to a Parliament; a constitution with privileges and traditions of hundreds of years' continuance, not a mere hasty gathering of deputies, collected by a summons from a king, who did not dare to refuse, extorted in the extremity of his weakness. It cannot be charged upon the Sicilians that they have shown an undue impatience of their new king; for eighteen months they endured his rule, and he showed no sign of reversing his father's policy. It was not till Sicily was lost, and all Southern Italy in open rebellion, that there came the tardy promise of a restoration of ancient rights. Does any one believe that promise would have been kept any better than the former one? Were the Sicilians, who had been twice guaranteed their rights, and twice had that guarantee withdrawn within the memory of hundreds yet living, going to prove themselves to be so credulous as to submit to be deceived a third time? Again, if we may believe but one half of the tales of tortures and dungeons, which, as we read in the newspapers, were revealed when the revolutionary army swept over the island, we can well understand the joy with which the people welcomed Garibaldi and his volunteers; and the enthusiasm with which they flew to arms as the only resource of an oppressed people. Would not a child, to return to our former analogy, be justified in calling in the aid of the law to compel his father to restore his guaranteed rights if unjustly deprived of them? Can we be surprised if the oppressed Sicilians appealed to the tribunal of Heaven against their perjured monarch? If Rehoboam lost half his kingdom, because he made 'his little finger thicker than his father's loins,' shall we be surprised if a modern king loses his whole dominions for a long course of duplicity and oppression?

Let us hear Mgr. Dupanloup, on this point:—

'Have the people rights relatively to those who govern them, and ought their legitimate wishes to be consulted? I have not a doubt on this head. To give a negative answer would be to sanction all tyranny, oppression, and enslavement: this I should shudder to do. Bossuet has truly said, after S. Thomas, "*The prince is not born for himself, he exists for others.*" In other words, the power is for the people, not the people for the power. Bossuet says again, "*The true part of the prince is to provide for the wants of the people. The prince who is useless to his people is culpable, as well as the cruel prince who oppresses them.*" The essential object, then, of the supreme power is the good of the people. Bossuet adds: "God's intention in establishing such great dis-

order, having heard, with mature deliberation, our Council of State, we have decided upon proclaiming, and we do proclaim, as irrevocably ratified by us, the following Constitution.'

tinction was not that some should be proud and the rest slaves. Our Sovereign Master has said that He came *not to be ministered unto, but to minister.* To serve, to sacrifice oneself to the good of those who are governed, is the end, the obligation, the sole reason of a social authority. And it is for this reason that it is entitled to the respect, the obedience, and even the gratitude of the people.'—Pp. 457, 458.

Again, still more to the case of the Italian States:—

'"Every one admits," says Puffendorf, "that the subjects of a monarch, when on the point of perishing, and having no succour to hope for from their sovereign, may make their submission to another prince."—"No part of a state," says Grotius, "has a right to detach itself from the body politic; unless that not to do so would expose it to manifest danger of perishing; for all human institutions seem to be subject to the tacit exception of a case of extreme necessity, when the natural law only can be considered." On this Grotius quotes S. Augustine, who is not less formal: "among all nations," says the holy doctor, "it has been considered a better course to submit to the yoke of a conqueror, than to suffer the last horrors of war, and be exterminated; such is, as it were, the voice of nature."'—P. 91.

It was on these principles—after a struggle of opinion carried on by the Non-jurors, sufficiently high-principled to vindicate a principle, and yet which so egregiously failed—that the Church and nation of England accepted the revolution of 1688, and the succession of the line of Hanover instead of the son of James II.; a succession which, at this very moment, excludes the more direct line of the House of Savoy from Henrietta, daughter of Charles I.

Again, the matter may be viewed in another light, which may help us to arrive at a proper judgment on the question. States have a personality in their corporate capacity; either a true corporation, as in a constitutional monarchy, or a corporation sole, as in an absolute one; and as such, as Mr. Gladstone argued in his now abandoned work, 'The State in its relation with the Church,' it has a conscience; and having this, it is amenable to the divine laws of reward and punishment, like any individual man; only that, as a state, in its corporate capacity, it has an existence only in this world, and not in that which is to come; so, unlike an individual man, it has its rewards and punishments in this life. We acknowledge this great truth whenever the state calls upon the people to fast and pray in time of war, pestilence, or famine; for we expect that a nation's repentance will avert a nation's ruin. When, as in an absolute monarchy, one person alone represents the personality, and that person violates the conscience of the state, may we not expect to see his sin visited on himself and his sons—himself ruined, but his people freed; and will any one question the justice of such a sentence? Will any one express surprise at seeing the royal family of Naples fugitives and vagabonds from their own home? On the other hand, it is a fact to be remembered, that Charles

Albert, King of Sardinia, was the first of all the monarchs of Europe to anticipate the revolution in 1848, and to grant his people a constitution, with a responsible ministry; and that, unlike his royal brethren, he has never, nor his son, recalled his promise, nor violated his word.[1] The universal confidence of Italians has been his reward; for now, by the voice of united Italy, the thrones of Italian princes, forfeited through their duplicity, have been bestowed on him.

Supposing, then, that Italian unity is a *fait accompli*, the annexation of Rome and Venice being only a question of time; what is to be the future of Roman Catholic Europe, and what the position of the Pope? That either can ever again be what they once were, we think we have shown to be impossible; there would have to be a revival of a faith among statesmen in the peculiar claims of the Papacy over kingdoms, such as we believe to be impossible, and there would have to be a submission on the part of governments and nations, such as we believe to be incompatible with modern notions of national independence. Every movement towards what are commonly understood as national liberties, renders it more impossible to endure the ecclesiastical supremacy of a foreign power. In England, long before the great national expression of ecclesiastical independence—we are speaking now only in a political sense, and not a religious—which resulted in the rejection of the Pope's supremacy, in the sixteenth century, the statutes of *Provisors* and *Præmunire* were the law of the realm: how the independence of the English Church received its finishing-stroke we shall go to a Roman Catholic writer to see:—

'It is a fearful and terrible example of a Catholic nation betrayed by a corrupted Catholic hierarchy. Englishmen have been betrayed, and what is more, betrayed by the very power, from whom, under God, they had a right to expect protection and safety. It was in a solemn convocation, when England's churchmen were assembled, a reverend array of bishops, and abbots, and dignitaries, in orphreyed copes and jewelled mitres. Every great cathedral, every diocese, every abbey was duly represented in that important synod; and yet the fear of a tyrant, and the dread of losing a few remaining years of wealth and dignity, so far prevailed, that they sacrificed the liberty of the English Church at one blow, that Church whose liberties at their several consecrations they had sworn to defend, whose freedom they were bound on oath and conscience to preserve. The deed is signed. Harry is declared the *supremum caput* of England's Church; not *vox populi*, but *by the voice of convocation* (sic); the Church is sacrificed, the people are sacrificed, and the actors in this vile surrender are the true and lawful bishops and clergy of England. One

[1] We must not be thought by these words to express our approval of the course of King Victor, much less that of his astute minister, Cavour—we are, perhaps, not yet in possession of sufficient knowledge of facts to decide the question—we are only looking at one point, that of kings keeping faith with their subjects in the matter of government.

venerable pre'ate, aged in years, and worn with fasting and discipline, alone protests against this sinful surrender; his remonstrance is unsupported by his colleagues, and he is speedily brought to trial and execution. His accusers are Catholics, his judges are Catholics, his jury are Catholics, his executioner is a Catholic; and the bells are ringing for high mass in the steeples of S. Paul's, as the aged bishop ascends the scaffold and receives the martyr's crown.'[1]

It was after the final separation from Rome that an excommunicated monarch dropped the title of 'Supreme Head,' and substituted the more humble one of 'Supreme Governor.'

A process with similar tendencies, though far more irregular in manner, is at this day going on in Italy: there the Catholic Government is acting on the principle of ecclesiastical independence, as well as civil: there too we see, as in England, that it has the support of the clergy. It is true there are bishops, who, like the noble Fisher of Rochester, are ready to suffer persecution for the cause of the Pope's supremacy; but, like him, they are few among the many who acquiesce in the great movement in favour of national independence. We believe that this principle will increase and grow with the spirit of Liberal institutions; persons accustomed to self-government will not long endure any foreign domination; the more they feel their own strength to walk alone, the more surely will they throw away the crutches on which they formerly leaned.

In fact, the independence of national churches, united under the primacy—not supremacy—of a patriarch, is the true idea of the unity of the Catholic Church. Long before Papal supremacy was heard of, the Church enjoyed unity under four Patriarchates; three of these still exist, in the unchanging East, in their primitive intention and design; all alike *spiritually* equal, but with, *ecclesiastically*, a gradation of dignity. When the fourth assumed the supremacy, the unity of Christ's body was broken; on far higher assumptions than were heard of in the tenth century, was the unity of Western Christendom more sadly marred and broken in the sixteenth; and the wounds yet remain unhealed, and the rents remain yet unrepaired. We believe that it is only by a return to first principles, to those of the primitive Church, that unity can ever be restored; as each nation assumes, as we are pretty sure it will assume, ecclesiastical independence, so are we approaching more nearly to the desired end. One thing alone can hinder it, and that is an obstinate clinging, on the part of the Pope, to a shadow of power, when the reality is departed—for departed it is, if unbelieved in. Given, national ecclesiastical independence, and no true Catholic will refuse to acknowledge the primacy of the

[1] 'An earnest Address on the Establishment of the Hierarchy,' by A. Welby Pugin, 1851. (Pp. 2, 3.)

See of Rome: grant the power to national Churches to arrange and alter, when required, national rites of worship, national forms of prayer, suited to each nation's needs and position, so that nothing is done to break the unity of the Faith, and such independence is wholly compatible with the unity of the Catholic Church. Above all, let us not have pseudo-councils of a few bishops to proclaim a new dogma—as we have seen when the *opinio pia*, at the best, of the immaculate conception was made an article of faith—but a free general council of the whole Patriarchate to discuss fairly and openly questions of doctrine. Let the Patriarch of Rome be contend to hold the position assigned to him at the second general council, that of first of the four great Patriarchates; a privilege awarded, not from inherent right, but because Rome was the capital of the world. The assumed claims of supremacy and infallibility being silently dropped, the union of the East and West would present few difficulties; each Patriarchate, and, more, each national Church, might retain its own peculiarities without destruction to unity. Oneness of faith would be found in the professing one creed—that agreed on by the second general council—the Constantinopolitan; oneness of love, in the common episcopate and the common sacrament. The whole Catholic Church, with all the individual varieties, would resemble the parts of a great Gothic cathedral, each having its own type, its own distinctive character, yet all harmonising in one grand whole, and presenting to the eye the unity of one vast, glorious, majestic temple of God.

Monseigneur Dupanloup gives us a clear and lucid history of the rise of the temporal power of the Pope, showing plainly that such dominion was no part of the ancient Primacy; nay, more, that, previous to the obtaining this earthly sovereignty, the Patriarch of the West declared himself the subject of the Eastern Emperor. The following is his summary:—

'Such was the providential order followed by events in Italy; such was the method chosen by God in establishing the sovereignty of the Holy See. We have carefully distinguished the periods:—

'1.—*Before Constantine*, in the first ages the Roman Church had neither sovereignty nor any temporal jurisdiction, but only very considerable properties, which she received from the liberality of Christians, and which were necessary to the exercise of her spiritual sovereignty.

'2.—*From Constantine to Gregory II.* the Popes possessed numerous patrimonies, several of which were really *principalities*. They had, too, particularly after the pontificate of S. Gregory the Great, an immense influence in temporal affairs, founded upon the respect and confidence of both princes and subjects, but not as yet any *sovereignty* properly so called.

'3.—*From Gregory* II. *to Charlemagne*, a *real sovereignty* existed; the learned have called it a *provisional* sovereignty; but, whatever its designation, it was real; it existed *de facto* and *de jure;* it had grown with time, and was based

upon long custom, and the gratitude of the people; it was contested by none, and it received involuntary and glorious homage even from the East. Rome and Italy were but expecting the hour of Providence.

'4.—At last this hour arrives, and Charlemagne receives the glorious mission of founding definitively the temporal sovereignty of the Holy See.'—Pp. 97, 98.

Again:—

'The Popes were so far from wishing to transform themselves into temporal princes, that they deplore bitterly and unceasingly this inevitable transformation. Their authority imposes itself upon them against their will; they submit to it, and it increases according as the perils of Italy, and as the weakness of the imperial power, becomes more obvious. *It would be wrong to reproach them with it or to tax them with usurpation*, as M. Guizot says; *so the natural course of things would have it: the clergy alone was morally alive, and vigorous; it gained power everywhere; such is the law of the universe.*'—(Italics, Mgr. Dupanloup.)

'And, what is more remarkable, at no period was the doctrine of the Church, as to the distinction of the two powers, the independence of the spiritual power in religious matters, and submission in temporals, more universally professed. We will cite the famous letter of the great Pope Gelasius to the Emperor Anastasius, the protector of the Eutychian heresy: "This world, august Emperor, is ruled by two powers, that of her pontiffs and that of kings; of these the charge of priests is so much the heavier, in that they shall have to answer before the tribunal of God for the souls of kings. You know, beloved son, that though you are above other men in dignity, yet you humble yourself before the bishops who preside over sacred things, and you apply to them for everything that concerns your salvation; and in the reception and administration of the divine sacraments you are bound to obey them, instead of commanding. You know, I say, that in all these things, you are dependent upon them, and that they cannot be subjected to your will. For if, *in temporal things, the ministers of religion obey your laws, knowing that you have received your power from above* (sic), how dutifully, I ask, ought you not to obey those who are charged with dispensing the august mysteries?"'—Pp. 84, 85.

Such was the temporal condition of the Patriarch of the West before he aspired to the supremacy; we may say, such his normal condition: the supremacy is a development, an excrescence of the Primacy; it might be beneficial, it might be necessary, for the times—we do not say it actually was, we are only giving it as an hypothesis—but it can but last with the times, or the condition of affairs, that called it into existence and supported its claims: when these are gone, it goes too. The very fact that Monseigneur Dupanloup insists on, viz. the necessity for a temporal sovereignty to sustain the independence of the spiritual supremacy, proves beyond question the human origin of the latter: 'My kingdom is not of this world,' said the true Head of the Church; He founded a kingdom, which would live in the world without the signs of a worldly kingdom: that would stand if every worldly prop were taken away. How different this is from the modern or Mediæval Papacy, Monseigneur Dupanloup's book is a proof: he lays down, as a *sine quâ non* for the maintaining the Papal supremacy, the following propositions:—

'That the temporal sovereignty of the Holy See is intimately united, in the designs of God, with its spiritual sovereignty.

'That the liberty of conscience and the independence of Catholic truth, are providentially united to the liberty and independence of the Pope.

'That for the security of the whole Church, it is necessary that the Pope be *free and independent* (sic).

'That this independence be *sovereign* (sic).

'That the Pope *be free, and that he appear free* (sic).

'That the Pope be free and independent *at home as well as abroad* (sic).

'Nor must these great principles be practically nullified by any hypocritical scheme or any degrading compromise.'—P. 149.

We say that a spiritual system which requires such supports as these, and can only exist when borne up upon them, carries within itself the seeds of its own decay, the disease which must one day paralyse its vital action; it confesses itself unable to do its great work, that for which it was sent, to fight and to overcome the world, for it may be overcome by the world; it is shored up by worldly props; when they are knocked away the fabric falls. Surely this is not that edifice whose foundations are on a rock, and of which the promise is, 'The gates of Hades shall not prevail against it.'

ART. VIII.—1. *Mosaic Cosmogony.* By C. W. GOODWIN, M.A.
2. KURTZ, *History of the Old Covenant.* Edinburgh: Clarke, 1859. London: J. W. Parker, 1860.

AMONG the Essays and Reviews, now unhappily so notorious, is one which, unless the fallacy of it is exposed without loss of time, bids fair to do more mischief than all the rest: for in proportion as it irritates less than the others, it impresses more. We speak of Mr. Goodwin's paper entitled 'Mosaic Cosmogony.' Calm and judicial in its tone, not querulous or aggressive; free from the transparent shallowness, and all but childish theorizing, of Dr. Temple's 'colossal man;' leaving to the scoffers their gibes, and irreverent petulance to those who delight in it; affecting no oracular sententiousness like Mr. Jowett,—it trusts to its weight for doing its work. With the air of a practised counsel, confident in the possession of a strong case, the writer fairly and dispassionately reviews all that has been said on the other side, and, having closed his brief, sits down in calm and not unimpressive expectation of a verdict.

Such, if we mistake not, will be the uncomfortable feeling with which many a reader will stand up from the perusal of this well-written paper. And long after the sophisms of the other Essays have been disposed of, a sense of the difficulties so well and clearly stated in this one will continue to haunt the mind, and awaken a desire, rather than a hope, that *exoriatur aliquis.* Many plain persons, and it may be some better informed ones, will fail to see any escape from the writer's conclusions, however portentous, that the 'Mosaic Cosmogony' 'is the speculation 'of some Hebrew Descartes or Newton, promulgated in all good 'faith as the best and most probable account that can be given of 'God's universe.' For it is not to be denied that the author, though he has not, perhaps, contributed any new ideas to the subject, has put, with telling neatness and clearness, the objections which lie against all modes hitherto suggested for bringing the statements in the first chapter of Genesis into exact harmony with the deductions of modern science. And the impression left is, not only that he has answered and refuted all those theories, but also, that his own theory remains master of the field.

These, however, be it observed, are two very different things. The destructive process is, by universal confession, far more easy than the constructive. Though we should admit to the utmost, and we do admit it, that no theory hitherto propounded has cleared up all the difficulties which beset this mighty problem,

it will not by any means follow that Mr. Goodwin's does so. And if, on the other hand, we can show (as, by a very simple method, we undertake to do) that his particular theory is radically and utterly untenable and absurd, it must then be allowed that he has left the question, as far as a perfect solution is concerned, exactly where he found it.

All that can then be said is, that the maintainers of the divine origin and proper truthfulness of the Mosaic narrative have been unable, hitherto—no very grave charge—to make a perfect adjustment between the two parts of this cloven tally; between the first and the last manifestations, made by God to man—the one by revelation, the other through science—on the subject of Creation. And may not even this arise from their not having duly imported into the discussion *all* the elements of the problem to be solved? May it not be, for example, that they have taken too narrow a range in their study, hitherto, of cosmogony, as it lies in the pages of Holy Scripture? that they have fixed their gaze too intently on the two first chapters of Genesis, regardless of supplementary and interpretative hints, or it may be, even of more systematic patefactions of the great creational mystery, scattered throughout the sacred Volume? We venture to think that such is the case. And, without presuming to say that we can, with our present information, demonstrate the perfect coincidence, in every particular, of the words of Moses with the results of scientific investigation, we shall, nevertheless, if we are not greatly mistaken, make thus much good to the satisfaction of our readers:—that the clue for unravelling this mighty maze is, at this stage of the inquiry, in the hands of the theologian, rather than of the man of science;—that, while science has made her voice heard with sufficient loudness and confidence, the *dicta* of theology and of the Bible on this particular subject have scarcely been evoked in all their fulness or significance hitherto; that, when their voice is truly elicited, they will be found to have a commission to interpret some of the most perplexing phenomena of natural science—for science, too, has her perplexities;—that theology, in fact, can go far to render a reason of the puzzles which science confesses to, and in so doing furnish an approximate solution of the great question, as to the harmony undoubtedly existing between the revealed Word and the visible works of God.

I. But our first care, though it need not detain us long, must be to demonstrate that Mr. Goodwin's view, above stated, is simply and irredeemably absurd.

It is, we affirm, as wild and imprudent a view as any man ever committed himself to, that the Mosaic account of the Creation was put forth, whether by a Hebrew writer or by any

other son of Adam, as 'the most probable account that could be given of God's universe.' We do not know what notions our essayist attaches to the word 'probable': but to our view, (and indeed he and his friends are never tired of urging upon us that it is so), that account is, in some very striking respects, exactly the most *improbable* that could be given, by the mere reason of man, of the mode of formation of the world we live in.

First, is any cavil more common than the objection, supposed to be fatal, that the sun and moon cannot, with any show of common sense, be assigned to the fourth day? The succession of days and nights, it is obvious, is dependent on the existence of those luminaries. Vegetation is dependent on them. How then is it that they do not appear on the stage of creation from the first? Now, religious geologists, it is well known, have something to say for themselves, to account for this paradox. But what possible defence can our essayist set up for it? What possible motive could a 'Hebrew Newton' have had for making such a representation? Wherein lies the probability of it, or its conformity to observation? This single feature in the Mosaic narrative, whether we can account for it or not, is at any rate a sufficient proof that that narrative was *not* written as a philosophical speculation. For it outrages, in the most gratuitous manner, the conclusions which an ordinary observer would arrive at upon the subject.

But, as if it was not enough thus to encumber his cosmogony with an improbability of the most obvious kind, the supposed philosophic author of the Mosaic account must needs introduce into it statements totally at variance with the condition of things which he saw around him. A signal instance of this is the emphatic and uncompromising assertion of a 'dominion' given to man, at his creation, 'over the fish of the sea, and over 'the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over every creeping '(*al.* living) thing that creepeth (*al.* moveth) upon the earth.' At what historic period, it may be confidently asked, has any such 'dominion' existed? Where is that dominion now? Where, save in the few mysterious years when the Second Adam was upon earth, and 'was with the wild beasts,'[1] and proved this power over the fishes of the sea? where, we ask, has that dominion been, save in His day and in His Person, 'since the making of the world?' How is that dominion, in the actual historic world, disallowed, scorned, contested, more or less in every department of animal life;—disallowed and only reluctantly submitted to even by the domestic animals;—scorned by the fowls of the air,

'And fish, like living shafts that pierce the main;'—

[1] S. Mark i. 13.

contested, and often turned against him, by the beasts of the field! It may be affirmed, indeed, that nothing more is meant here than that superiority of position, and those arts of taming and subduing, which man possesses: and that this view is countenanced by the 8th Psalm, which, though belonging to historic times, asserts the dominion of man in the same terms. But we may reply that the Psalmist, to say the least, may equally well be understood as adopting the *ipsissima verba* of Genesis with reference to man's rightful position, apart from his fall. As Hengstenberg says,—

'The Psalm stands in the closest connection with the first chapter of Genesis. What is written here of the dignity with which God invested man over the works of His hands, whom He placed as His representative upon earth, and endowed with the lordship of creation, *that* is here made the subject of contemplation and praise. We have just that passage in Genesis turned into a prayer for us. How far man really possesses that glory; what remains of it; how much of it has been lost: of this the Psalmist takes no account.'

So, again, though something resembling this 'dominion' is recognised after the Flood (Gen. ix. 2), there is a clear discrimination between the two things meant. In the latter case it is only said, 'The fear of you and the dread of you shall be upon every beast of the earth,' &c. In a word, the upholder of the Divine origin of Genesis, and of a real Fall, can render a perfectly satisfactory account both of the strong language in Genesis itself, and of subsequent applications or modifications of it.

'No creature, it is true, is so strong, so alert, but that man, though relatively one of the weakest creatures, in process of time becomes its master. Nevertheless there is a vast difference between before and since the Fall, in this respect. Before that, the obedience of all creatures to the appointed vicegerent of God, was a spontaneous one; after it, his subjects revolted against him, as he against his Lord. He must maintain against them a hard conflict; must on all hands employ art and cunning; and though, on the whole, he remains conqueror in this warfare, yet in particulars, he has to suffer many defeats.'

So says, and with perfect consistency, and literal acceptance of the text, the ordinary commentator on this topic. But what can our essayist find to say? Only by explaining away the strong and clear language of Genesis can he escape the predicament of making his author of a cosmogony, forsooth, founded on what he observed around him, guilty of a most senseless ignoring of those phenomena. And then what becomes of his charge against all other writers, of 'representing the Mosaic narrative as a series of equivocations, a story which "palters with us in a double sense"'? If the author of Genesis did not mean to predicate of man, at his creation, a very different relation to the lower creatures than now exists, it is perfectly unaccountable that he should have used such stringent and comprehensive language, tending in that direction.

What, again, can Mr. Goodwin say to the plainly implied, though perhaps not positively affirmed, declaration that, at the first, man and beast and fowl were all alike herbivorous only, and not carnivorous at all (i. 29, 30)? How could such an account be rendered of the natural world, by one who merely 'saw that all which lay within his reach had been formed for 'the service and benefit of man'? What had such a one to do if he expected to be believed, but to record the institution, from the beginning, of a didactic law permitting animal as well as vegetable food; not of one which seems to forbid it?

As to the difficulty of conceiving that the animal world underwent at the Fall such a change of condition, as to become carnivorous in its habits, it is, after all, only a difficulty and a mystery; not, like our essayist's position, an absurdity. And, be it more or less a difficulty, it is one which, in kind, Scripture in a manner takes upon itself: in that it vouches for a real change of condition, both as to form and habits of diet, in the case of one animal at least—the serpent—as the result of the Fall; and intimates that a similar fate had in various degrees befallen the rest. 'Thou art cursed *above* all cattle, and above 'every beast of the field; upon thy belly shalt thou go, and '*dust shalt thou eat.*' And that 'the lion should eat straw like the ox' is elsewhere spoken of as one effect of the removal of the curse in the latter days (Isaiah xi. 7). Whether we take this as purely figurative or not, it points back to a non-carnivorous habit in the wild beasts in the days of innocence. But Mr. Goodwin is bound, in virtue of *his* theory, to point out some non-carnivorous *historic* period as a standing point for his philosophic cosmogonist.

But in truth it would be endless to enumerate all the glaring improbabilities with which the enlightened natural philosopher, hypothesized by the essayist, has loaded his narrative. The scheme of the Mosaic cosmogony, as a whole, no less than in many of its details, is the very last that such a one would have dreamt of prepondering. How comes it that the mighty work of creation is there represented as having been wrought in six days? Granting, as we for our parts are ready enough to do, that the first verse of Genesis covers countless ages of cosmical genesis; yet why is the production of the entire existing face of things crowded into so brief a period? Are the operations of nature so rapid, as to have suggested, for example, the idea of the drainage of the entire earth, sufficiently for vegetation, and the actual upgrowth of all manner of herbs and trees, within the compass of a single day? And the like questions might be asked as to the works assigned to the other days. But we forbear. Enough has been said to establish the fact,

that Mr. Goodwin's theory has not an inch of standing ground within the four corners of the first page of the Bible. The Mosaic narrative, if, as our modern wits contend, too incorrect to have been dictated by God, is nevertheless, by universal admission, too grand to have been written by a fool. But whereas the heathen Longinus, even, could speak of Moses as *ἀνὴρ οὐκ ὁ τυχὼν*, 'noordinary person,' Mr. Goodwin's 'Hebrew Newton' is a very ordinary person indeed; one who could neither describe what he saw, nor reason logically upon it. Is it too much to hope that he will henceforth disappear, in company with the 'colossal man,' and the Moloch-worshipping Abraham, from the category of conceivable entities?

II. But we turn with much satisfaction to our more grateful task of indicating a point of view, from which the harmony of biblical and scientific cosmogony will be, if not perfectly, yet not obscurely discerned. We are to show that theology places in the mind of the inquirer a clue to thread the maze before us, that it imports into the discussion elements to the forgetfulness of which most of the difficulty and obscurity of the subject is due. And we beg the attention of our readers to a few plain principles or considerations which must lie at the basis of any trustworthy attempt to read aright this great riddle.

In the first place, we have just used the term *biblical* cosmogony. And we have done so designedly. That of *Mosaic* cosmogony, employed by Mr. Goodwin as the title of his essay, but not peculiar to him, is a misleading one. It proceeds upon the assumption that the history of creation is written exclusively in the two first chapters of Genesis. There is no greater mistake than this. It is, as is well known, by no means certain that the Pentateuch is the oldest book in the Bible. It is probable, to say the least, that some one or two of the Psalms, and the Book of Job, are older. But however that be, we find both in these Books, and elsewhere in Scripture, creational statements and intimations of the most profoundly interesting kind; clear additions, at least in point of detail, to what Moses has recorded for us in Genesis. And these hints for the reconstruction of a Scriptural cosmogony only die out, as will be shown presently, with the last chapter of the Revelation. This is the first thing to be borne in mind.

The next is, that the very ancient interpretation, which severs the first verse of Genesis from the rest of the chapter, by an interval of unknown vastness, is by no means a mere shift to get rid of a difficulty. On the contrary, it obtains the most distinct recognition in all the principal cosmogonal passages above referred to. Nay, it is most remarkable, and comes in

with a marvellous appositeness as a help to solve questions raised by geology, that those passages tell us far more about this pre-hexameral period, so to designate it, than about the hexameron or six days' work itself. Allusions to the latter, of a nature to add anything to our cosmogonal knowledge, are very rare: it is on the former period only that much additional light is thrown.

A third principle to be laid down is, that in dealing with this subject,—having in view, that is to say, to harmonize observed phenomena with revealed declarations,—it is perfectly irrational to ignore or leave out of view the spiritual element. We desire that it may be distinctly understood what we mean by the spiritual element in this place. We say, then, that he who, in attempting to give an account of the origin of evil, should ignore the personal existence of certain spiritual beings, and of their connexion with the sin of man, is one with whom we, for our parts, could not argue. Such a one plainly begs the whole question as between himself and a believer in Revelation. Now we are writing as believers in Revelation: and as, if our subject were (which it is not), the origin of evil and the Redemption of man, we could not afford to concede the existence of Satan, and of the action of spiritual natures such as his upon the fortunes of the world, both physical and spiritual; so neither can we afford to ignore that action in this present discussion. For it is a question, be it remembered, as to the harmony of science and theology: and theology involves, as a postulate, the existence of Satan and spiritual agencies, as certainly as science assumes gravitation or the inductive principle. Science chooses *her* ground, and it is but reason that theology should choose hers likewise. We premise this, in case any should be disposed to cavil at the degree in which spiritual existences and agencies are recognised in the following inquiry.

Let us remark, then, for a moment, as to the Mosaic account, that it is now very generally conceded, and indeed results from the most cursory view of the narrative, that not everything that is mentioned within the six days was created, or brought out of nothing within those days. The plainest instance of this, perhaps, is that on the third day it is, expressly, the mere *emergence* of the earth from the waters, and not the creation, nor even, so to speak, the manipulation of it by the Divine Hand, that is recorded. But it is equally plain that the work of the second day was not the creation of the waters, but the separation of them into two groups, by the interposition of the firmament. And in the case of the plants, fishes and fowls, animals, and man, the elements out of which they are formed are distinctly supposed to be already in existence. For the origination of all

this material we are thrown back, by the very terms of the narration, on a previous period. We cannot say the same, however, either of the light, or of the receptacles of it—the sun, moon, and stars. But it is admitted that the term 'made,' applied to these last, is ambiguous, and may well signify appointment rather than formation; while, of the light, nothing is recorded but a fiat, which may equally have reference to its creation, adaptation, or mere admission. The narrative itself, therefore, in part distinctly supposes and requires, and in part admits of, such a pre-hexameral preparation of elements and substances as it is now customary to discern in the brief record, 'In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.'

Next, a recognition of this remote and rudimentary period runs, we affirm, through the Scriptures. Take first the 90th Psalm; superscribed, as is well known, 'a prayer of Moses, the man of God.' The *formation* of the mountains and the earth is surely there referred to a period of inconceivably remote antiquity. That event could not otherwise afford any measure or conception of the Divine eternity *ex parte ante;* which in the Psalmist's idea it manifestly does. 'Before the mountains were 'brought forth, or ever Thou hadst formed the earth and the 'world, even from everlasting to everlasting, Thou art God.' No one could know better than Moses, that the visible world did *not* receive its present form at a very remote period. Or even if the superscription be given up (which there is no reason whatever for doing, the Psalm bearing strong internal evidence of Mosaic origin), the language itself abundantly bears out our view of it.

But a far more remarkable recognition of the gradual and inconceivably remote formation of the earth occurs in the Book of Proverbs. It is the personified Wisdom of God that speaks. 'I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the 'earth was. When there were no depths, I was brought forth. . . 'Before the mountains were settled, before the hills was I brought 'forth: while as yet He had not made the earth, nor the fields, 'nor the beginning (Heb. head) of the dust of the world. When 'He prepared the heavens, I was there; when He set a compass '(or circle) upon the face of the depth . . . when He ap-'pointed the foundations of the earth.'[1] We would draw attention to the pointedly rudimentary character of the operations here described. It is, we conceive, simply impossible, reading them in their context, not to be carried away far beyond the range of the six days' creation, into the illimitable and unfathomable period preceding it. Some of the expressions are doubtless ambiguous. We cannot be sure what is meant by 'setting a

[1] Proverbs viii. 23—29.

compass on the face of the depth,' though it refers not improbably to the preparatory measurements necessary for any kind of exact workmanship. But the ideas of preparation, of laying of foundations, of initiatory and rudimentary processes, howsoever expressed, pervade the whole passage. And the remoteness of those processes is sufficiently guaranteed to us by the use elsewhere made of the phrase 'before the foundations of the world,' to express the actions or purposes of God from all eternity. Specially we might mention the language of our Lord Himself, 'For Thou lovedst Me before the foundation of the world;' an apparent allusion to the continuation of this passage in Proverbs, 'Or ere the earth was. . . . When He appointed the 'foundations of the earth; then I was by Him, as One brought 'up with Him; and I was daily His delight.'

It need hardly be added that this cosmogonal phraseology, particularly the term 'foundations of the world,' is familiar to the Prophets and the Psalmists. Those 'foundations' are spoken of as having been 'laid,' as being 'searched out,' 'shaken,' and 'discovered,' thus revealing to the eye of man the primordial processes of creation. Even the 'foundations of the heavens'[1] are in one place spoken of. And in all cases there is a real allusion, in virtue of the term used in the original, to the building up or concretion of the world from small beginnings. It is not merely the bottom or lowest point, but gradual origination that is spoken of in the term 'foundations.'

But of all passages of this kind, the palm must be given to a magnificent one in the Book of Job (ch. xxxviii.) A large and important chapter there is added—if indeed it does not take the lead in point of antiquity—to the Mosaic cosmogonal record; and specially, perhaps exclusively, to the records of the prehexameral period. 'Where wast thou when I laid the founda-'tions of the earth? Who hath laid the measures thereof, or 'who hath stretched out the line upon it? Whereupon are the 'foundations thereof fastened? or who laid the corner-stone 'thereof, when the morning stars sang together, and all the 'sons of God shouted for joy?' It is needless to dwell on the primordial character of this passage. But we desire to point out that in the last clause of it we have something more than a mere development (which is all that we derive from the passages cited hitherto) of the brief record in the first verse of the Bible. New cosmogonal facts or circumstances are there revealed to us or certified to us for the first time.

First, the interpretation which has on independent grounds been put upon Gen. i. 16, viz. that the heavenly bodies were of

[1] 2 Samuel xxii. 8.

earlier origin than the earth, is here confirmed by authority. For the 'morning stars,' at least, whatever be meant by that designation, are represented as having attained their completion, at a time when the earth was yet in the most rudimentary stage of its formation. And secondly, we obtain, at the same time, a marvellous but undoubted glimpse of an interest taken by certain spiritual beings already existing, in the creation or first founding of the terrestrial globe. As we know that the angels take at the present hour a certain profound interest (1 Pet. i. 12; Eph. iii. 10) in God's New Creation, the Church, so no less certainly do we know that they felt pleasure and transport in the first beginning of the Old. And the words in which this is made known to us so couple together 'sons of God' and the 'morning-stars,' as to lead to the conclusion, especially in a Hebrew composition, that there was some close connexion between them; so that the singing of the morning stars, and the shouting of the sons of God, are but two names for one and the same thing. It is also to be observed that, if we may insist on the expression '*all* the sons of God,' it follows that no fall had as yet taken place among the angelic hosts. So that the fact which this remarkable verse of Job certifies to us, is that of creation having proceeded, at least down to the epoch of the most rudimentary formation of the globe, and we know not how much later, with an entire concurrence and harmony of will, in this matter, as in all else, between God and 'the sons of God.' The obedient elements, not stimulated or acted upon by any second or contrariant will, performed thus far, we cannot doubt, without fault or resistance, the behests of Him who made them.

But in the very next verses, taken in conjunction with similar intimations scattered throughout the Bible, we learn the more remarkable but no less certain fact, that at some subsequent period this state of harmony and obedience was interrupted. The great elements or agents, the water, the light, the air, appears in a condition of open rebellion against God. Emphatically, too, 'the morning,' 'the dayspring,' is found among the rebels; thus intimating (considering the connexion just spoken of between the angels and the morning stars) angelic complicity in the elemental rebellion, and angelic action,—the action of *fallen angels*,—as the secret and mainspring of it. 'Who shut up the sea with doors, when it brake forth as if it 'had issued out of the womb? What time I made the cloud the 'garment thereof, and thick darkness a swaddling band for it, 'and brake up for it my decreed place, (or established my decree 'upon it,) and set bars and doors, and said, Hitherto shalt thou 'go, but no further, and here shall thy proud waves be stayed? 'Hast thou commanded the *morning* since thy days; and *caused*

'*the dayspring to know his place*, that it might take hold of the 'ends of the earth, that the *Wicked Ones* (Matt. xiii. 38, *al.*) '*might be shaken out of it?* It is turned as clay to the seal,'—rightly interpreted of the regular revolution of the sun in the heavens, as a cylindrical seal of clay makes its impress by revolution, 'and from the Wicked Ones their light is withholden, and the high arm shall be broken.' It may be freely admitted that this sublime passage, standing by itself, could hardly establish the mysterious facts we deduce from it. But taken in connexion with others, that interpretation becomes irresistible. That the language of *rebuke* is here used towards the *sea* is certainly the impression of any plain reader. We might be disposed, however, if it stand alone, to view it as merely a mode of speech to express a Divine fiat, and to suppose that the idea of resistance is only accidentally introduced. But when we find it recurring again and again, as the habitually exhibited relation[1] of the Almighty to the sea, since the Fall, that it is antagonistic and needs repression; and when especially we call to mind the 'rebuking' of the winds and the sea by Christ, we can no longer doubt that in this place of Job we have recorded the origin and first outbreak of elemental rebellion. We cannot but remark, that our Lord, while He 'blesses' the bread, 'rebukes' the elements of water and air, as He does also the powers of evil; thus placing both, apparently, in the same category of rebels against His Will.

In like manner, the idea that the *light* had arisen in a mysterious rebellion against God, is not only contained in the passage of Job, but largely confirmed by various other passages. The term, 'Hast thou caused the dayspring to *know his place*,' is one of stern rebuke. Thus, when Gideon returned triumphant, he 'made the men of Succoth to know,' as our margin renders it, by beating them with briers. And of the particular act by which God rebuked and quelled the rebellious element of light, and that too in connexion with the angelic race, we have surely no small knowledge in Scripture. That 'Lucifer, son of the morning,' fell, at some time or other, from heaven, is as certain a fact of angelology as any that we are acquainted with; and the passage in which we are first informed of it[2] throws considerable light at the same time on the circumstances of that fall. The address of the prophet Isaiah to the king of Babylon is manifestly based on certain real, universally known, and admitted facts in angelic history, which served to exhibit, as

[1] Isaiah v. 22; xxxi. 35. Psalms lxxxix. 9; xxix. 10; xciii. throughout. Prov. iii. 29. Isaiah i. 15. Job xxvi. 12.

[2] Isaiah xiv. 12.

nothing else could have done, the greatness and the fall of the mighty King. The rest of the kings of the earth are represented as thus addressing him on his going down into *sheol*. 'How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, (marg. day star) 'son of the morning? For thou hast said in thine heart, I will 'ascend into heaven; I will exalt my throne above the stars of 'God; I will ascend above the height of the clouds; I will be 'like the Most High!' Surely we read here no obscure page of celestial and pre-terrestrial history. We discern an intimate conjunction between some mighty being who fell, and the 'day star,' or 'morning star.' The desire of pre-eminence above his fellows, (themselves also connected in some way with the stars) and even the ambition of being like the Most High, had evidently led to his 'fall from heaven.' And so far as any power was given to him over the 'day star' or 'morning,' (and it is implied, by his being called by those names, that he had such power) his impious and rebellious attempt—whatever the exact nature of it, which it is impossible for us to know—might well involve some serious disturbance of cosmical and cosmogonal laws, and could hardly but do so. More especially, knowing, as we now do, how intimately the balance of the terrestrial elements—and especially of the sea—is bound up in the integrity of the solar system; how truly the moon is 'the governess of floods,' though in subordination to the supreme attractive force of the sun;—we see that such celestial disturbance might most naturally be followed by irregular action of the waters of the globe. Hence would result at once that rebellious condition of the sea which we have seen ascribed in Job to the rudimentary period of the earth's existence: and this again would disorganize the earth's terrestrial element.

It need hardly be added, that the reality of the fall from heaven of a great prince among the angels, and his connexion with the light, and especially with the stars, is fully recognised in the New Testament. Our Lord 'beheld Satan *as lightning*, fall from heaven;' and a fully detailed account is rendered in the Revelation of his final casting out. Nay, it is much to be observed, that as it is certain that, in a general way, the exaltation of Christ affected not men only, but angels; a new order of things having ensued therefrom in heavenly places by the gathering of the angels into the One Body (Eph. i. 21—23), of which He is the Head—so does He especially take to Himself, in the last chapter of the Revelation, the name, and doubtless in some sense the original position of the fallen Lucifer. As He became a new and more excellent Head to the human race, so did He to the heavenly hierarchy become a new and more glorious Day Star, and Prince among angels. 'I am the

root and offspring of David, and the bright and Morning Star.' It is surely exceedingly remarkable that the original and unfallen condition of the angels when first we obtain a glimpse of it in Job,—the fall of Satan and his angels,—and the final re-constitution of the universe, inclusive of the unfallen angels, under Christ, should thus be all alike spoken of in close connexion with natural light, with the stars, and specially with morning, and the morning star.

Nor would we have it supposed that what has here been laid before the reader is any novel or private speculation. As to the fall of a portion of the angelic host with Satan at their head,—that is the universal belief of the early ecclesiastical writers. The time of that event, indeed, they differ about, or leave it an open question; nor does it appear to have occurred to them to connect the chaotic or pre-hexameral condition of the earth with it, as its result. Yet that view, too, may claim some considerable antiquity. Kurtz, the latest, and not least able of German writers on this subject, observes that[1] 'in 'the tenth century, Edgar, king of England, said, "as God drove 'the angels from the earth, whereupon it was changed into 'chaos, he had now placed kings upon the earth, that justice might 'obtain there."'[1] And in more recent times the view has been embraced as highly probable by a host of writers, including many of the ablest and soundest of the recent continental writers: we may mention Stier, F. Schlegel, Guericke, and Baumgarten. The last named, in his Apostolic History, in treating of Acts xxvi, xxvii, has developed the whole idea with peculiar power. And it is thoroughly supported by analogy that, if the angels fell at any creational period whatsoever, their fall would introduce confusion into the universe. For such was confessedly the immediate effect of the fall of man, itself the work of Satan, on the world of *his* day. As that fall smote the department of being placed under his charge, the animal and vegetable world; so might the angels' fall be expected to confound and disorganise, first, the stellar world, committed apparently to their keeping, and next through it, the whole realm of terrestrial being.

Let us now proceed to inquire what degree of light is thrown by the primeval facts thus disclosed to us, upon the harmonisation of science and Scripture in the matter of cosmogony.

I. And first, the existence of a genetic period of immense duration, previous to the six days, rests no longer on a single verse of the Bible, nor appears as a mere resource of the religious astronomer or geologist, but as a pervading doctrine of the Holy Scriptures. To that period the Bible, by plainest implications,

[1] Kurtz on the Old Covenant, vol. i. p. 57. Ed. Clarke. 1859.

refers—1. the creation and completion of the stars, or, however, of certain of them, and—2. certain disturbances and recombinations of the great elements or agents of light, water, and earth, subsequently to the creation of the rudiments of the terrestrial globe. Now the first of these facts covers all that is required to bring Scripture into harmony with astronomical discovery. And the second allows ample scope for all the phenomena disclosed to us by geological research.

But further, by bringing into view the intervention of the spiritual world of being, the facts here set forth tend to solve certain perplexities, incident both to astronomical and geological science. A great writer and philosopher has expatiated [1] with much eloquence on the striking phenomenon of the *waste of worlds*, in one sense, which astronomy makes known to us. As in the lower present and natural world, so also, in the higher and more ancient walk of creation, sterility and failure are, in a manner, and to a very great extent, the law of being. The countless unproductive ova of the fish have their counter-part in the waste uninhabitable worlds of space; specially, *e.g.* in our planetary system. For it is conceded, that unless we suppose different natural laws to obtain (which is infinitely improbable) in the other planets, from those which prevail in our own, those planets are, for the most part at least, uninhabitable. Now science, while she is constrained to record this, can render no *rationale* of it. It is contrary to the conclusions or expectations which she has formed from observing, as a general rule, that design, and fitness for a purpose, pervade all organisation and all being. It is true, a negative reason can be assigned for such waste, if so we may reverently call it—viz. to enhance the dignity of moral above material being. For that world is not wasted, which forms a step in a gradation of which man is the summit; or which exhibits the boundless resources of the Maker of all. Nor is the view altogether unpleasing or unworthy, which represents all these worlds as so many 'coils from the awful lathe,' or so many 'sparks from the mighty anvil, when the universe lay incandescent thereon.' But the view labours under the disadvantage of assimilating God's operations with man's, and representing Him as subject to imperfections in His working. But admit the idea of interference and thwarting of the divine purpose, in the cosmogonic period, by rebel power (conceded of course by Him), and all is explained. It becomes, then, as intelligible, that there should be unproductive worlds, as that there should be 'curse and barren land.'

In geology, again, it is well worth considering, to say the least, whether the peculiar, and in many respects, unexpected

[1] Whewell, The Plurality of Worlds.

character of the phenomena may not most rationally be explained,—if indeed it can be explained in any other way,—by recognising this struggle of two opposing wills; this thwarting and hindering of the destined and natural processes of creation. For what does geology reveal? Is it the orderly and peaceful upgrowth of a world, such as might be looked for at the hands of a God of order, and harmony, and peace? No; but a series of inconceivably tremendous destructions, overthrows, submergencies, and conflagrations; *out of which*, indeed, order and good is made to result by an overruling Will; but which in themselves are confusion and ruin. It is *between* these catastrophes that successive periods of creation and growth are discovered, and even these periods themselves abound in violent and destructive operations. Or is it, again, *life*—and life alone—that, by the evidence of geology, breathes throughout the cosmogonic period? Are 'the generations of the' pre-hexameral 'world healthful,' and is 'no poison of death found in them?' On the contrary, death is rife, violence and cruelty reign amongst the animal creation of the whole fossil period. How is such a state of things to be accounted for, if we leave out the supposition that we have been contending for? What other reflection can we make on these gigantic confusions—this reign of death, struggling against and mastering life—than that 'an enemy hath done this?' Seen from this point of view, however, the geologic phenomena become intelligible, as far as we are capable of understanding such matters. For we now behold effects for which we can assign a cause.

And we commend it to the consideration of religious geologists, whether this be not the solution likewise of the peculiarly *monstrous* character of many of the geological creatures. Let it not be said that we have no warrant for pronouncing any creatures of God's Hand monstrous. Thus much, at least, we know, that mixture of kinds is, as might be expected, displeasing to Him, and is denounced as such in the old law (Lev. xix. 19); while it is especially declared as a law of the six days' creation, that each production was 'after its kind.' And may we not attribute it to the mysterious interfering agencies, that the fossil creatures should exhibit combinations acknowledged by science herself, were it only in the names given to them, to be in some degree unnatural? Such is the ichthyosaurus, with 'the snout of a dolphin, the teeth of a 'crocodile, the head and breast-bone of a lizard, extremities 'like the marine mammalia, and vertebræ like a fish.' Again, whereas the normal number of vertebræ in mammalia is now seven, 'alike in the short neck of the whale, and in the long, flexible neck of the giraffe,' while even reptiles have but

eight at most, the plesiosaurus had no less than forty-one. This has the appearance of a departure from the designed perfection. But chief among monstrosities is to be reckoned the hideous pterodactyle, 'one of those flying reptiles that have no existing type—the most unlike anything that exists in this known world;' a combination of bird and crocodile, bat, lizard, duck, and ape. Nor is it without bearing on the present point, that Satan is described to us by the name of one of these monsters of heterogeneous combination, the dragon.

So once more, the pleasing theory that there has been a *strictly* gradual scale of progress, in point of organisation, in the various kinds, and from inorganic being up to man, must, it is now well known, be given up. Traces of entirely organised fish, *e.g.*, have been found side by side with the corals and shells of the lower formations. Might it not seem as if perfection, attained at first at a single bound, had been again and again thrown back and retarded, so as not to become, for a long time after, a prevailing law?

II. But it is upon the work of the great Six Days, above all, as detailed in the Mosaic narative, that the facts we have pointed out shed an extraordinary and most satisfactory light.

In the first place, the recognition in Scripture of a previous creational and formative period, absolves us from all necessity of putting any constraint upon the term 'days.' We take them to be, as the narrative surely implies, literal and natural days, measured out by the sun, or by the revolution of the earth on its axis. The existence of the solar economy, whatever its exact condition may have been, is all but involved in the biblical facts we have adduced, or at the least is in perfect harmony with them. We need not then have recourse to Hugh Miller's ingenious and beautiful, but baseless hypothesis, or any other which makes the days to be vast periods.

Next, as the *first* verse of Genesis covers the vast geologic periods, with their awful series of submergencies and successive creations, so does the *second* verse briefly describe the latest and *de facto* condition of the terrestrial globe at the time when the six day's work began. The state to which the thwarting and rebel agency had now, not for the first time, reduced the globe, was one, 1st of ruin; 2d, of submergence; and 3d, of darkness.

1st. 'The earth was without form and void.' This expression, as is well known, refers in the only other passages where it occurs,[1] to a superinduced ruin; to devastation and desolation of that which had once been fair and fruitful. 'I beheld the earth, and lo it was formless and void; and the

[1] Jeremiah iv. 23. Isaiah xxxiv. 11.

'heavens, and they had no light. I beheld, and lo there was no 'man; the fruitful place was a wilderness, and all the cities 'thereof were broken down.' The last great geological overthrow, which preceded the human period, had done its work, and produced, not indeed chaos, but universal ruin.

2d. Above the earth lay the waters. 'The face of the deep' was the only 'face' or outward appearance that presented itself. Once more had 'the sea,' in the words of Job, 'broken forth as if it had issued out of the womb.' The disturbance, whatever its exact nature, of the solar and stellar economy, had, as often in times past, drawn the awful veil of waters over the globe.

3d. On the face of that deep, was 'darkness;' arising not from the absence or non-existence of the sun, but, as is probable, from thick clouds or mists lying upon it; 'the cloud, its garment, and thick darkness a swaddling band for it.' (Job xxxviii. 9.)

And now let it be marked how exactly the recorded order of the Divine operation corresponds to this threefold condition of the globe, and to the order of its causation. To dispel the darkness by the admission of the light; to divide the waters and clouds; to uncover the earth: these were the natural restorative processes, and this the order of them. As the light had been, in a mysterious way, the arch-rebel of created elements, so is it first called back to order, and 'made to know his place.' 'The Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters. And 'God said, Let there be light, and there was light.' Whatever had held back the light from the face of that deep—a secret impenetrable to us,—was dispelled and overcome. Next, an expanse, dividing the waters or watery elements among themselves, by an intervening atmosphere, 'gave them' also 'a law which should not be broken.' And, lastly, the assembling of the waters into their appointed receptacles, making the dry land appear, once more 'set a bound for the sea which it never,' but once, 'should pass.' All this, we say, is, humanly speaking, the very order and method which the facts of the previous cosmogonal period would lead us to expect. With this difference, however, that in this final series of creational acts, the processes, as indicated by the language, are as strikingly calm, and devoid of violence, as in the former instances they were full of violence and rebuke. It should seem as if now at length the peaceful consummation of creative energy had dawned; as if the strong enemy was mysteriously bound, and the elements, freed from all antagonistic contest, joyfully and peacefully did the behest of God. No menace is addressed to the light, no rebuke to the waters; there is no mention of the casting down of Lucifer, of 'bars or doors,' of pride or resistance. Instead of this, a succession of unimpassioned, unimpeded, and majestic fiats suffices to accomplish the work. The Six Days' Creation, in a word,

far from being the first effort, was the last calm triumph of creative power and love; the bringing to perfection of a world from which the spirit of evil and confusion had, after many sore struggles, been cast out. *Now*, though never perhaps heretofore, could it be said, at each step of the creation, that 'God saw that it was good':—good, without any admixture or influence of evil as heretofore, and in its kind perfect.

And surely this cannot but approve itself to us, on the slightest reflection, as the key to all that is most striking and characteristic in the Mosaic cosmogonal narrative: viz.: that the work there recorded was not merely a positive one of creation, but also a negative and antagonistic one of re-constitution, however calm and passionless the antagonism. Not a 'Genesis' only, as the Alexandrine Greeks rightly as far as they went entitled it; but a Kosmos, as the classical Greeks, with their keener eye for beauty and order, deemed Creation to be. Nor, we may add, a Kosmos only, but—what mere observation, until these later scientific days, could not have discovered,—a *re*-assertion of order as against previous confusion. This, we say, is plainly written on the structure of the Mosaic story, and almost in its every expression. To divide and to rule, no less than to create and form: to *divide* 'light from 'darkness, with an adamant; and day from night; and waters 'of one destination from waters of another; to discriminate and 'secure the succession of seasons, days and years; to mark the 'bounds of kind, in the vegetable and animal world: and again to 'establish *rule* and *dominion* in the world thus re-habilitated, by 'setting lords and vicegerents over it; rule in heaven, where rule 'had first been broken, viz. two great lights to rule over the day 'and over the night, and to divide the light from the darkness;' dominion on earth, given to man over fish and fowl, and cattle, and creeping thing: these are, over and above the production of so much goodly being, the recorded purposes of the six days' creation.

The sedulous and emphatic discrimination of *kinds* is peculiarly deserving of attention. Coupling it, on the one hand, with the monstrous character of the geological formations, perhaps we may say both vegetable and animal; and on the other with the prohibition, in later times, of mixture of kinds, whether of plants or animals,—we cannot but behold in it the vindication of a law heretofore trespassed against.

But above all, the most remarkable and perplexing feature of the Mosaic narrative, for such at first sight it is, viz. that the sun, and moon, and stars, should find no mention until the fourth day, becomes, from the point of view here indicated, sufficiently intelligible. We have already pointed out, that the work of the three first days was simply the vindication, in the natural

order, of the Divine Will, hitherto thwarted and opposed, in respect of the three great agents or elements of light, water, and earth. Nothing is there said of the conditions of being to which the sidereal world had been reduced through the same thwarting agency. But the analogy of their foregone history, as above traced out, would lead us to conclude, even before positive evidence, that its proper action on the terrestrial globe was in some way impeded. And we have only to suppose that this was but partially restored in the first instance, and on the first day, sufficiently for the purpose then in hand: while their complete and perfect restoration was reserved until these more general laws had been vindicated and re-established. When light, air, sea, and land, had, in a general way, been rescued from their state of ruin, and the earth moreover had even brought forth its natural produce of herbs and trees; then were the sun, moon, and stars, brought to their perfection, and finally constituted as rulers of the day and night, of seasons and years. It has indeed been conjectured, and with some plausibility, that the revolutions of the earth upon its axis may have been somewhat slower until then.

'From the fourth day onward the sun ruled the day, and the moon the night, when in all likelihood the same order commenced which now prevails. But it is impossible to determine the duration of the three first days, when the duration of daylight and darkness depended on laws with which at present we are not acquainted.'—(Kurtz, p. 24.)

Thus may the making, or 'appointing'—for such is a very frequent meaning of the word—of two great lights, and of the stars, on the fourth day, be very fairly, to say the least, accounted for by consideration of that condition of things, of which the six days' creation was the crowning process. That casting down of 'Lucifer, son of the morning,' which had ages ago taken place, but which had not left him without disturbing power, was now consummated by the final setting of the heavenly bodies in their appointed spheres of duty.

And it is most remarkable, that classical antiquity has preserved a distinct and unmistakeable record, in a legendary power of this mighty transaction. We have already seen that the prophet Isaiah assumes a general knowledge on the part of the eastern nations, of the fact of Lucifer's original fall. But the classical legend combines that fall with the *restitution of the sun to his place, and to his work of governing.* It represents Phaeton, the Phosphorus—or Lucifer of the Scriptures—as presuming to drive the chariot of the sun, and causing a conflagration by going too near the earth: whereupon he is cast down to the earth by Jupiter. This legend has been some-

times traced to the standing still of the sun at the command of Joshua. But there is little resemblance between the two: whereas between the action and fortunes of Phaeton and Lucifer, the identity is perfect. Lucretius thus describes, in magnificent language, his casting down by the father of gods and men, and the resumption by the sun of his proper functions.

> 'At Pater omnipotens, irâ tum perculsus acri,
> Magnanimum Phaethonta repenti fulminis ictu
> *Deturbavit equis in terram;* solque, cadenti
> Obvius, *æternam suscepit lampada mundi,*
> Disjectosque redegit equos, junxitque trementes;
> *Inde suum per iter recreavit cuncta gubernans.*'

A few points still remain to be noticed as confirming the view that restored order was the ruling aim of the six days' work. Thus it is not without significance that we are told that God *called* the great agents by names expressive, doubtless, of their destined work. God '*called* the light day, and darkness 'night; and the firmament, Heaven; and the dry land, earth; 'and the gathering together of waters, seas.' By *names*, in after ages, powers and position conferred were conferred; as on Abraham, Jacob, Moses, and many others. Nay, the work of Christ himself, and His final exaltation, were wrapt up and conferred in the Name of Jesus. And so, doubtless, was it here. So again, when to man the dominion of the earth has been committed, his first exercise of it consists in his giving names to all creatures. And whether he derive his name of Adam from *adamah*, 'the earth,' or connect it with his being the likeness (*damah*), the image and earthly vicegerent of God; in either case, it expresses his dominion. Nor can we fail, lastly, to remark, that the summing up of the six days' work describes it as a cosmos or ordering. 'Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, all the order (κόσμος) of them.' For the word there and elsewhere translated 'host' (*tsaba*), has for its fundamental idea that of regularity; whence its various meanings of a regular place of meeting for worship; a fixed time; of an army, &c.

We have purposely confined ourselves, in our brief survey of the hexameron, to the Mosaic account. But, as we have already intimated, some additional particulars or illustrations, though few, are contributed by other parts of Scripture. Thus, Psalm civ., while manifestly taking that account as its basis, deals with the subject, in several respects, from a different point of view. We have remarked on the entire absence in Genesis of the language of rebuke or even of constraint, contrary to what we meet with in the earlier cosmogonal period.

But in this Psalm it is said, 'At Thy rebuke they fled; at the voice of Thy thunder they hasted away for fear.' So Hengstenberg, who adds that 'the expression "the waters shall assemble 'in one place" (Gen. i. 9), appears here as a rebuke of God, 'because God is the enemy of disorder; and because the water 'stood in an attitude of hostility to the realization of His pur-'pose, to manifest His glory on the earth.' The Psalm, therefore, if we may venture to say so, dealing more comprehensively with the creational subject, recognises, while the Mosaic account studiously puts out of view, the opposition which was in reality overcome in the work of uncovering the earth. And the mention of the thunder is a new cosmogonal fact. So again, while applying to the moon the Mosaic expression, 'He *appointed* the moon for seasons' (the term rendered in Genesis, *made*), of the sun the Psalmist says, 'The sun knoweth his going down,' recalling the minatory language in Job, 'Hast thou made the day-star to know his place?' to which the same remark applies. And at the conclusion, the Psalm seems distinctly to recognise the moral and spiritual bearing of the six days' creation, in the words, 'Let the sinners be consumed out of the earth, and let the wicked be no more;' closely parallel to the place in Job, having reference to the corrective nature of God in the rudimentary period of creation, 'that 'the wicked ones might be shaken out of it, and the high arm be 'broken.' Take, again, Psalm cxlviii., expanded afterwards into the Song of the Three Children. It places the sun and moon next after the angels, thus intimating the immense antiquity of the heavenly bodies; and hints darkly at 'a line' which had at some time been 'broken,' but should be so no more. While Psalm cxlvii. adds to our cosmogonal knowledge, 'God's calling of the *stars* by their names;' as Moses tells us that He imposed names on, of day and night, heaven, earth, and sea. And it is plainly here spoken of as an element of order and rule, that He did so: for such is the drift of the entire Psalm, which is 'an allegorical representation of His government of His people.' Instances of God's thus calling the stars by their names are found in the sequel of the oft-cited passage of Job xxxviii. 31, 32. And the numbering and naming of the 'host,' or entire κόσμος of His works is dwelt on in His own words by Isaiah, 'Lift up your eyes on high, and behold who hath created all 'these, that bringeth out their host by number: He calleth them 'all by names by the greatness of His might.' (Is. xl. 26.)

Nor, finally, is the seventh-day rest of God without its bearing on our subject. If God 'rested and was refreshed' (Exod. xxxi. 17), we naturally look beyond the mere creation, however stupendous, of a physical universe, to the calm but potent

quelling of adverse spiritual might, as the secret of that mysterious rest and refreshment. And well might God rejoice in His works, and man be instructed to imitate that rest and joy, if creation was not creation only, but also a 'stilling of the enemy and the avenger.'

Let us say, finally, that the physical creation becomes a far livelier and more exact type of the spiritual, if it, too, was not a genesis only, but a regeneration—if the waters of the great deep, with which Satanic might had whelmed the earthly grave, proved to it, as the Red Sea to Israel, a baptism unto a new life from the grave of all being; and if there was a word, not of birth only, but of death unto sin, and new birth unto righteousness in the calm fiat, 'Let there be light.'

ART. IX.—1. *Sermons preached before the University of Oxford.* By ROBERT SCOTT, D.D., Master of Balliol College, and Prebendary of Exeter. London: John Murray. 1860.

2. *Sermons on the Beatitudes, with others mostly preached before the University of Oxford; to which is added a Preface relating to the recent volume of 'Essays and Reviews.'* By GEORGE MOBERLY, D.C.L., Head Master of Winchester College. Oxford and London: J. H. and Jas. Parker. 1860.

AT the present moment the religious teaching of Oxford is regarded with intense interest by the whole English Church. It is not parents only who so regard it, anxious for the souls of their children, and fearing lest they should be drawn aside from the faith by the influence of that intellectual malaria which seems to hang about that sacred spot; but all who look with interest to the next generation of our clergy, and to the young men who are to form the influential body of the educated classes in the coming age. Doubtless, it is difficult to estimate the extent to which young men are really influenced by the latest intellectual novelties. They appear to be so much more than they really are. Sometimes they take up views, simply because they are novelties, or because they are themselves ambitious to be in the foremost lines of thought, and what is old and was generally held in the generation before them, is on that very account depreciated in their minds. Sometimes it might appear that they just wish to know what is said, and talked of, and debated by all the world. Sometimes they seem, with the natural generosity of youth, to sympathise with those who, as they imagine, are treated unfairly, misrepresented, or condemned unheard. And in Oxford the personal characters and the generous labours of some teachers are well known, and cause a prepossession in their favour in that place, and a kindliness of feeling towards them which might seem to persons at a distance incompatible with a deep and earnest repudiation of their errors in religion. Still, it is scarcely possible the young who tamper with such error should not suffer—in some cases to the utter ruin of their faith and hope, in others to the impairing them—or where the noxious teaching touches them ever so slightly, to the dulling the brightness of these graces. And it must be matter of anxious interest to us to know what is the state of religious opinion among the students of our ancient University, and what is the teaching which they hear from the pulpit of the University.

With this latter point in view, we have read the two volumes of University Sermons, recently published. The well-known characters of their authors sufficiently vouch for the soundness of the views inculcated in them, and for the ability with which they are expressed. And we believe that both the preachers attracted large audiences of members of the University of all ages, and were listened to with earnest and deep attention; Dr. Moberly's sermons being preached chiefly within the last two years. It is some assurance of the soundness of Oxford, on the whole, that such preaching should have been so heard, and so sought after.

The problem of a University sermon may seem hard to solve. What shall the character of that discourse be which is addressed to hearers of cultivated minds, acute reasoners, from their daily occupation practised in close and exact thought—to men of learning and science, and almost by profession critics, yet still with souls to save, with affections to be elicited, with special temptations, trials, difficulties?—hearers, too, divided into the classes of the teachers and the taught, of the elder and the younger—the younger comprehending a very large proportion for whom some topics, and a style of treatment which would be suited to the elder portion of the hearers, would have few attractions, and be almost unintelligible? There must be solid thought; there must be an earnest practical tone; there must be something fresh to be conveyed in information or in reflection, and something that will draw out and cultivate the religious affections. We believe that both in Oxford and Cambridge an earnest practical preacher is always attractive. Men's deepest feelings are their strongest feelings; and they will go to hear a preacher from whom they hope to gain real spiritual help; but what passes as practical preaching, or succeeds in appealing to the feelings or imagination, or is considered eloquence before a mixed congregation—that is, of necessity, a congregation containing a very large portion of uneducated, or half-educated, people—would not be listened to by an academical audience. It would be speaking to the intellectual man in the language and with the thoughts adapted to the uneducated. Yet it is because such preaching is distasteful to an University audience that they are supposed to tolerate only what is dry and unspiritual.

The sermons of the Master of Balliol are a confutation of this view. A tone of gentle sincere piety pervades them. The preacher never loses sight of the fact that he is addressing men who have religious affections and religious interests, many trials now, and hopes and fears beyond this world. Dr. Scott had been many years a resident in Oxford, and one of her most elegant and accomplished scholars, before he devoted himself to

the duties of a country parish. He returned to the University with the experience and the tone of mind acquired in his pastoral charge, in the direct care of souls, and amid the trials of life; and his sermons bear marks of these experiences. The Head Master of Winchester College has probably never known much of the ordinary duties of a parish priest, but he has had the teaching and training of youthful minds of a high cast of ability, and the spiritual oversight of those from whom the University is recruited; and when he preached, he was speaking, as he himself says, to those who had been his own special charge, his children in the faith. This gives a point to the practical teaching of Dr. Moberly's sermons. He is addressing those whose course he has watched, whose trials he knows, whose well-being is most near to his heart—and he speaks in earnest. His sermons appear to us to be among the best of our day, and to be pre-eminently adapted to the University pulpit. The style is of the purest English, exquisitely clear and graceful, and with just so much of beauty as pleases without suggesting the notion of ornament. The ideas are such as naturally occur to an accomplished man addressing persons whose line of thought is on the same level as his own, and they are introduced with the utmost ease and freedom. The preacher is evidently in the right place, and has his audience well in hand.

But we believe our readers will be more gratified by extracts from the sermons than by our remarks.

We select the following very practical passage from Dr. Scott's Sermons, as expressing what was, we have no doubt, the experience of the parish priest and the college tutor, on the difficulty interposed by conventional ideas and feelings to the free spiritual intercourse of 'the Teacher and the Disciple':—

'There are the poor of Christ's heritage needing and thirsting for instruction in doctrine and guidance of life; but shy of intruding on the studies or occupations of their minister, of occupying his time, or of taking the first word in talking of the subjects which are nearest to their hearts. And there are pastors, men of prayer and meditation, earnest in character, abounding in the richest treasures of things new and old, which befit the scribe instructed to the kingdom of God,—such men as the studies, the influences, the communion of a school like this, are powerful to mould,—men, who, but for one deficiency, might evangelize the world;—longing to pour forth the emotions of their hearts as well as the stores of their intellects; but wanting the power to doff the wrappings of conventional reserve, and to place themselves heart to heart, as well as face to face, with the immortal beings who will rise beside them in the day of the Lord. And thus, the step is not made; the ice is not broken; time after time their communings fall short of the point from which all would be sure to flow on full and clear;—and they part, strangers as before; nay, more estranged, because they part with a sense of recoil on both sides. But if the mischief is on both sides, judge ye on which side is the greater responsibility!

'And is not the same evil at work, under a slightly modified form, even in this spot, from which the Church's and nation's teachers are from year to year issuing forth? Nay, is it not rather here that the harmful influence is imbibed? Would it be so widely felt throughout the land, were it not first felt here? For here, too, there is the same general relation between the teacher and the taught, the pastor and the disciple. They are drawn together by every impulse of love and sense of duty: but they are kept apart by the repulsion of etiquette and conventionality, by constraints of feeling and reserves of manner. Does the teacher always in such intercourse sufficiently remember that he was once himself a pupil? Does the pupil sufficiently feel that his teacher may yet retain enough of fresh feelings and youthful impulses to understand *his?* Do both sufficiently grasp and use the fact that there is this point of contact between their spirits;—the fact, that the points of difference and separation which thrust themselves forward, are stamped even by this very obtrusiveness, as being things external and accidental; but that the inner reality is, that heart beats to heart in Christian love? Sad indeed it is that between such classes, among such persons, we may see Christian love hidden by a mask of coldness on the one part and shyness on the other,—perhaps of stern authority on one, and jealous independence on the other. And as time passes and opportunities slip away, the younger go forth from hence without the impression, which might have been made for good on their ductile minds at a turning point of life: the elder go on striving, but with ineffectual efforts; carried round and round in a cycle of disappointment:—and the flowers drop, one by one, from coronels which might have bloomed in Paradise.

'If we did but look on those who are entrusted to our charge, not merely in a strict and hard way, as persons for whom we have to give account, but as those who are the helpers of our joy;—if they did but look on us, as watching, not merely *over* them, but *for* them, loving them, yearning towards them;—if each looked on the other as his joy and crown at the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ, how different the face of the Church of God would be; how differently would the Lord's work be done, as by those who felt themselves no longer servants, but friends.

'Where then do the difficulty and the evil reside?

'Not often, I trust and believe, in a want of zeal and affection in those who stand in a pastoral relation to others. Not often in any want of amiability, or any contumacious independence on the part of the disciples. Still more rarely, we may hope, in recklessness on the one hand or profligacy on the other. But commonly in the want of a mutual understanding, the want of openness in those who ought to be beyond all others confidential. *We want faith.* This is the secret of our shrinking. We want faith, and therefore we suspect others of a want of love. Men have not the courage to unbosom themselves, for fear of meeting with coldness or ridicule. And each watches in vain for the first tokens of that affection which he dares not be the first to offer, though he would return it with his whole heart. And they are kept apart by this false shame. Both lose what they need and crave. Both are hardened and grow suspicious. And perhaps the suspicions of both in time make themselves true;—the openness of youth clouded with premature craft; the influence of riper years lost in selfish cowardice. And thus pastor and flock, teacher and pupil are estranged; a blessing is changed into a curse; and when they have to give account, it must be done by both with grief, it must be unprofitable for both.'—Pp. 16—20.

Of the same character is the first sermon in the volume, on 'Great and Small Trials,' breathing throughout the tone of practical religious experience. Its thoughts are very simple, such as might be uttered in a village church, yet, we doubt not,

meeting with a response in the hearts of the learned and intellectual audience in St. Mary's.

Dr. Scott seems to take up as subjects for his sermons the most ordinary topics, as the titles of his sermons will show—'The Pharisee and the Sadducee,' 'The Publican,' 'The Rich Man and Lazarus'—and then to treat them with a grace and freshness which gives them all the charm of novelty. Indeed, in some of these sermons is illustrated the method of dealing successfully with the greater difficulty of introducing learning and theological knowledge, without interrupting the natural and simple flow of thought.

We give the following from the last sermon in the volume, 'The Book Lost and Found,' as a specimen of the earnest practical character of Dr. Scott's teaching on the study of Holy Scripture:—

'Remember, that it was *in the Temple* that the Book was lost of old. And so, too often, it is even now. Unhappily, we cannot deny that there are some among us, who will not hear, will not read; to whom their Bible is a sealed book, their chapel a rarely trodden floor; or so trodden, as to be profaned with what the wise man calls "the sacrifice of fools." And so, while the dew of Heaven falls round them, they are dry as Gideon's fleece. They are indeed in the temple; but only as those who sold oxen and sheep, and the changers of money, whom Christ drove out of it.

And there are those who give their bodily presence, and do not of set purpose close their ears. But they do not open them. Their heart does not go with them. They listen to God's Word as to an idle tale: and while idle tales remain in their memory, God's Word slips away. Thus the parable of the Sower is daily fulfilled before our eyes, and among ourselves.

But, to pass from these cases, which may well be called extreme,—there are other persons who listen a little; and read a little; and reflect a little; and form something of a resolution to do more—at a convenient season. But, oh, that convenient season! Is it for our imitation that the example of Felix is recorded? When we hear his "Go thy way for this time; when I have a convenient season, I will call for thee;" does not the Apostle's "Behold, now is the accepted time, behold, *now* is the day of salvation," ring in our ears the knell of souls that have not only lost the Gospel, but have flung it away, when it has found them?

Nay, not only such as shrink from the Word of God, lose it here, where all are called upon to study it and show that they are acquainted with it. You may have it in your hands; you may read it; you may impress it on your memory: and yet in all this, you may be losing it. This is no mere possibility. It is a sad fact of every day. And why? Because you are reading it for your examinations! God forbid, indeed, that such a cause should be fairly charged with such an effect. But there is a known danger attending all privileges, whether the use of God's Word, or the ministry of His Church, or whatever they may be,—the danger of profaning them by familiarity. And those whose study of the Bible has for its be-all and end-all the schools of the University, will lose it in the heart, while they are fixing it in the head. Their heart is hardened, their spiritual sense is dulled. Must we not fear lest "the letter" kill such students of it; because that spirit is quenched within them, which should have been in harmony with the Spirit speaking through it?'—Pp. 341, 343.

From Dr. Moberly's first sermon on the First Beatitude, we extract this eminently practical passage. After speaking of the apparent difficulty of reconciling poverty of spirit, with the activity and energy of practical life, he says:—

'But that truth *may* blend with the things of this earth. It was not given, it is not designed to be, a matter of mere unpractical speculation and admiration. It is by no means the exclusive possession of such as live in the cloister or the hermitage, make vows of voluntary poverty, or in other such mistaken ways "bid their neighbour and their work farewell" in the attempt "to wind themselves," not so much "too high," as in a wrong way, and to the neglect of the real means of elevation, towards heaven.

'The hermit is as wrong as the worlding. Both think evangelical holiness and real life things incompatible with each other, though they select differently which of these things, supposed to be incompatible, they will follow. But they are not incompatible; they are very far from being incompatible. On the contrary, if the truth of God be faithfully and deeply digested, if a Christian man have fully taken into his heart the certain blessedness of poverty of spirit, have his spirit's love set altogether upon the high places of the spiritual kingdom, and by consequence is entirely, sacredly, unaffectedly lowly in respect of the successes and distinctions, and other high places of the earth, who is there in all the world so sure as he is to discharge his earthly offices and duties well, loftily, nobly, angelically well? No petty personal objects distract his view; no indirect aims perplex it. For God's sake and in God's service he does that with all his might which God has given him to do, in the earthly place which he has assigned him, and to God he looks for his reward. If he be statesman, if he be soldier, if he be merchant, if he be student, what view of his duties or what motive to discharge them well will lead him on so straight, or keep him so clear of indirectness and perplexity, as this one? It is not impossible, indeed, that the very clearness of his course to his own spiritual sight may make it seem a strange, or an unintelligible, or even an inconsistent one to men around him. Those who have lost their way among the trees of the valley cannot appreciate the directness of the track which he follows who has seen his road from the hill. But he knows whom he serves, and what he seeks, and why he labours; and he serves, and seeks, and labours all the more directly and all the more vigorously because he knows it.'—Pp. 12, 13.

In his discourse on the Third Beatitude, Dr. Moberly understands the 'inheriting the earth' promised to the meek literally. After ably arguing the point exegetically, he says:—

'Surely, then, we must needs believe that the meek have in some literal way the promise of inheriting this earth; that besides the blessings stored for them in the heavenly kingdom, blessings, no doubt, of the choicest and best, for who are to hold higher rank in that kingdom than those who are most like the meek humility of little children, those who have learned best to copy the likeness of him who was meek and lowly of heart?—besides, I say, these blessings, they have the particular and wondrous promise of inheriting this very earth. Strange, wonderful, inexplicable as it may sound, we must face the plain words of revelation, and endeavour to fathom by God's grace the mystery, how it should be that in this scene of violence, of craft, of selfishness, of oppression, of evil passion, and success of evil, yet are the meek—these lowly, loving, self-renouncing, gentle, meek, these lambs among the wolves—the true inheritors, the rightful lords, by divine heirship, of this dark and stormy world in which it is our lot to live.'—Pp. 49, 50.

He then most beautifully exhibits the power of meekness. 'It gets what men call *moral power*, that is, *essential* power.' 'None feel its irresistible superiority more strongly than those 'who for a time overwhelm it.' And after many excellent suggestions of the real power won by meekness, he exclaims:—

'Who wields this world? In all the immense and untraceable complication of causes and influences in which we live, who and where is he, who and which are they who direct, who really govern, by whom cities, and nations, and continents, and the whole family of mankind pass through their history, meet with their fortunes, to whom they owe as to men their blessings,—the world's benefactors, the world's real rulers? Who are they who in any generation or series of generations have made one nation happier, greater, more blessed than another? Is it they who in each generation are the highest and most prominent in apparent station and power in a land? Generals, statesmen, princes? they whom blind men think the movers of the world,—and history, well-nigh as blind, alone records for the memory of future ages? Do the effigies of kings and bishops that seem, as corbels, to support the weight of the roofs of our vaulted cathedrals, is it indeed they that bear the roof, or does the roof bear them? Nay, amid the pageantry of earthly powers, and the imaginary effects of much earthly counsel and wisdom, how much we forget how all the course of the world's history, how the successes and the downfalls of nations, the blessings and the judgments, are all within the continual control of the Most High God, and what are those acts, and what those graces in the hearts of his servants, which He is pleased to visit in mercy, and bless with abundant prosperity to themselves, their neighbours, their cities, and their country. We know not where, nor by whom, among the sons of men this divine sovereignty —for it is verily a part of the sovereignty of God—is wielded most; we cannot tell which and who are they to whom, as to men, nations owe their safety:—

"No,—where th' upholding grace is won,
We dare not ask, nor Heaven would tell,
But sure from many a hidden dell,
From many a rural nook unthought of there,
Rises for that proud world the saints' prevailing prayer."

'It is now about a hundred and fifty years since there lived in this country two well-known persons, whose character and history may well illustrate the doctrine and truth of which I speak. The one was one of the greatest men of his time, one whose name occupies one of the principal and brightest pages of common history. A principal agent in the revolution which placed William the Third on the throne of England, he became in the following reign the most powerful and wealthiest of subjects. Through his wife he obtained unlimited power over his sovereign. He was the greatest general of modern history, unequalled until this generation. He repressed the pride and checked the conquests of the Great Monarch, and conquered his most famous leaders. His victories rank among the foremost achievements of the British arms. The result of his wars was a peace, which in the very lowness of the terms on which it was concluded promised to settle upon a new and equitable basis the contending claims of many and mighty nations.

'The other had, in earlier years, been lifted from obscurity and made a bishop of the Church of England; but at the time I speak of he was deprived of all position and emolument because he refused the oaths to the new government. He was poor, evil-spoken of, and watched with jealousy even in his gifts of charity. So little apparent weight had he, or those who acted with him in the apparent events of English history, that in a recent work of con-

siderable ability and fame, which records that history from the early part of the last century, neither his name nor theirs, neither his conduct nor theirs, neither his existence nor theirs is so much as mentioned.

'And yet, if any man should attempt to guage the influence, the real lasting influence, of these two men upon mankind,—the real essential enduring power,—the true weight on man, on his being, on his heart, on his prospects, on his real self,—which, think you, has most truly inherited this earth in power, the author of the Morning and Evening Hymns, or the conqueror of Blenheim? he, whose simple words and few, not in themselves either particularly able or particularly beautiful, whose few simple words make, and have made, and no doubt will make sweet Christian music in the hearts of millions who have never heard nor known his name,—or he, whose station, ability, and success blazed before the world's eyes for a few years, and, their effects swept away after a time by other events, then disappeared absolutely and for ever?'—Pp. 55—58.

The sermon, on 'Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness,' appears to have been preached last in the series in the University pulpit. It contains these earnest words in reference to the existing circumstances of the place:—

'Tell me not that those who would weaken your belief, your trustful, Christian, lifelong belief in the atoning Blood of your Lord, are amiable, kindly, pious. It may be so; the danger may not improbably be not the less because it is so. I judge them not: but if you listen to such things, if you let such doubts get hold of your minds, if you allow your faith in the atoning Blood of your Lord to be intellectually shaken, you will go near to lose the most precious joy and peace which is given to weak and sinful man upon this earth, the joy and peace in believing. Imagine not that such have discovered a deeper knowledge, are men of profounder mind, are able to lead you into loftier intellectual fields than those which the saints of God have trodden in every age from the apostles. "Knowledge puffeth up: charity edifieth." It is not Christian charity which helps to unsettle,—and that in days when every cavil is welcomed, and a pious-seeming man who gives up ever so many points of the sacred inherited truth is hailed as a godsend by all the scoffers and unbelievers in the land,—which helps, I say, to unsettle the simple honest faith of those who have been bred up in the love and fear of God. Nor is it knowledge. It is no knowledge which puts out of sight the consenting witness of the Church of God, the very pillar and ground of the truth, the witness of eighteen hundred years, and claims to interpret by the wretched guesswork of modern philosophy the sacred Scriptures. Oh! my young brethren, among whom there are many who are to me as sons, I do not lament that you should hear and know of such things, for it is your inevitable trial—nay, more, it is the very price you pay for freedom of thought, and in freedom of thought your ultimate faith finds and recognises its strongest and most unassailable foundations; we do not wish your faith, the faith of educated men, to rest on blindness, or deafness, or dulness, or shrinking, or flight;—no; I do not lament that you should hear of such things, but I do most earnestly pray you to cling to your Saviour, ("Lord: to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life,") to cling to your prayers, to let no canker of impureness or wilful sin undermine the faith which these false views would attack in the superstructure. Half your strength in the intellectual struggle is *moral;* all of it is *spiritual.* If you forget your prayers, if you are negligent of Holy Communion, if you allow sin, of any of the defiling kinds in which it most solicits young men, to get a hold upon your habits, you are already half won to unbelief. The conclusions of the new philosophy are too welcome to a sinner's soul not

to find ready access to his reason, when his heart is already gained. I have not now the duty of arguing against this philosophy; suffice it for the present, and in connexion with my present subject, to warn you emphatically that as you learn to throw discredit on the doctrine of the Atonement of Christ, so do you inevitably, and in the same proportion, disable yourself from ever feeling again, except by a miracle of mercy, that sacred, gracious hunger and thirst after Christ, your pardoning righteousness, which is blessed, because it shall surely and eternally be filled.—Pp. 73—75.

We pass over the sermon on the Blessedness of Purity of Heart. This sermon was, we believe, published separately soon after it was preached, at the request of the hearers. We have rarely read any discourse which combines so entirely delicacy of tone, with really searching words, on the very serious subject on which it treats. We are obliged to confine ourselves to one passage, in which the sense of our Blessed Lord's words, on the eagles and the Body, generally received among early writers, is most vividly and beautifully illustrated:—

'These passages, I say, confirm the doctrine that the souls of the pure win a kind of heavenly sense, necessary for the seeing of God as He is,—the God, that is, of mercy and love,—in His eternal kingdom of glory and joy. And remember, too, that striking passage of St. Luke's Gospel, in which the Lord, after explaining to His disciples "*when* the kingdom of God should come," and likening it to the suddenness and brightness of the lightning, goes on to answer their further question, "*Where*, Lord?" by the remarkable image of the birds of prey flocking to the carcase. As though He said, Do you then ask further *where* the Lord shall come? where you must go to meet Him? where, on all this round globe, shall the place of His appearing be, so that you may go there and be ready to meet Him if you be alive, or be buried there if you die, so as any way to be ready as you can to fly to Him at the first news of His return? Do you ask, I say, *where?* See how the birds of prey flock to the dead body! See how, when camel or horse falls down in the midst of the wildest and most arid desert, where, as far as the eye of man can strain, no sign of animal or vegetable life is to be discovered on any side, see how instantly the dark speck of some vulture, or other bird that feeds on carrion, is to be seen on the distant horizon, sailing up from the east or west, from the north or south, to reach its far-discovered food! What sense warns that distant bird? what sight, what smell, what unknown faculty informs it that what it seeks is here? Something, like to that sense, whatever it may be,—something, at least, which from that sense we may conceive and understand, will bring the just, will bring the people of God, from every quarter under heaven, to meet their risen Lord. Something, like to that wonderful and unexplored faculty which leads the bird with unerring direction to its nest, and the bee to its hive, which has been known, over and over again, to guide a poor dog to its well-known home over many miles of country wholly untraversed and unknown before, shall surely gather together the people of God from all the lands under heaven, to meet in good time their own dear Lord—whom they have believed, loved, imitated—when He returns in judgment upon the earth.'—Pp. 103—105.

Two of the sermons appear to have been preached in the series of Lent Sermons which the present Bishop of Oxford introduced. And they are beautiful specimens of searching

practical discourses, addressed to educated men. They are on 'Judas Iscariot' and 'The Convictions of Balaam.'

We cannot, however, close this article without noticing the preface, though its general character is probably already well-known to our readers. The very valuable observations on the 'Essays and Reviews,' to which it is devoted, are thus modestly introduced:—

'I trust that I may not seem to be doing an arrogant or presumptuous thing in coming forward to make a few free remarks upon this volume. My long connexion with the University of Oxford, both personal and through many pupils, rendered closer of late years by my having been called to preach in Oxford the greater part of the Sermons printed in this volume, makes me take more than ordinary interest in the theological teaching there prevalent. It is also hardly to be denied that some of the most forward and active of those who are engaged in such teaching there, are either writers in the present volume, or supposed to be in very close sympathy with them, while the large majority of the clergy of the University, though disapproving of these opinions, have not yet come forward in any public way to express or justify their disapprobation. I am far from professing to be the mouthpiece of this general feeling: I desire that the few observations which I propose to make may be considered as addressed to my own pupils in the University. If they are of any weight, others will read them. If they are not, I shall be well content to hope that they may have done no harm to the sacred cause of Holy Scripture and Catholic truth, and to trust that others may come forward with more power to vindicate them against what one of these writers well calls "the negative theology" of the present generation, the most dangerous, because the most insidious, form of attack upon the truth, as I think, to which it has yet been subject.'—*Pref.* pp. iii. iv.

It is obviously impossible that in so short a space Dr. Moberly could do more than touch slightly on the subject. He examines one professed object of the writers, 'to help doubters and obviate difficulties:'—

'Are then the "difficulties" which we are thus urged, under penalty of bitterness on the part of our adversaries, to consider with tender respect, which interfering thus with man's conscience, and being at variance with his intellectual convictions, impede this blessed union and peace of minds,—few, slight, or unimportant?

'Let us gather a few of them up, as they are scattered over the pages of this volume. *Specimen-difficulties* indeed, only, they are: for from the unsystematic nature of essay-writing, as well as from the other published writings of many of the Essayists, we may be perfectly sure that they are only a few of the difficulties which they really feel. Yet these may at least serve to shew us to what sort of extent the ordinary belief of Christian people requires to be shaken to pieces before such happy consent of consciences and intellectual convictions, as several of the Essayists are sanguine enough to expect, can be attained.—*Ibid.* p. viii.

The *specimen-difficulties* run through the whole of the Old and New Testament—affect Prophecy, Miracles, Doctrines, Creeds, and Sacraments—leaving nothing settled that they touch upon. Dr. Moberly proceeds:—

'These may be regarded as a specimen of the difficulties of the new, or "negative theology." They are, indeed, only specimens; not only because, as I before observed, the same writers, as well as others of their school, have given utterance to many other, and very grave ones, in other publications; but even in this unhappy volume. with its guerilla warfare of essays, hundreds of points are touched, none completed. A general loosening of all that has been hitherto held sacred seems to be intended rather than a grave discussion of any particular difficulty. There is a wide and very random scattering of uneasiness. The writers may possibly hold some things in religion sacred affirmatively, (though it is difficult to conceive what these things, in respect of four at least of the seven, may be); but in the present case they seem to have met, like the triumvirs of old, and drawn up a list of proscriptions.'—*Ibid.* p. xix.

Again, after a few lines, he says:—

'The writers claim consideration, tenderness, respect. Is this a well-founded claim? If the forty-two per cent. who stayed away from church on a particular Sunday in 1851 are distressed in their intellectual depths by all these "difficulties," (which, however, is surely an absurd supposition,) is it quite fair to scatter these wild firebrands of infidelity among the fifty-eight per cent., who, with much greater reason, may be counted as contented with the Christianity of their fathers? May not they more reasonably claim consideration and respect? Is it reasonable to demand the respect of believers, very many of them unable from want of leisure and learning to examine such deep questions for themselves, for men who, not in the way of serious and complete discussion of single points, but in the assumption of superior intellect, knowledge, and love of truth, throw random discredit upon every point of that holy faith wherein they have their peace in life, and their hope in death? I desire to speak with all caution and self-restraint, but may I not reasonably ask this question? Suppose, for a moment, that the Holy Scriptures *are* the Word of the Spirit of God,—that the miracles, including the resurrection of Christ, are actual objective facts, which have really happened,—that the doctrines of the Church are true, and the Creeds the authoritative expositions of them,—and that men are to reach salvation through faith in Christ Virgin-born, according to the Scriptures, and making atonement for their sins upon the cross. On this supposition, is not the publication of this book an act of real hostility to God's truth, and one which endangers the faith and salvation of men? and is this hostility less real, or the danger diminished, because the writers are all clergymen, some of them tutors and schoolmasters, because they wear the dress, and use the language of friends, and threaten us with bitter opposition if we do not regard them as such?

'It is quite possible,—it is more than possible, I believe it to be the actual state of the case,—that the writers themselves, or, at least, some of them, are eagerly desirous of an affirmative standing-place of faith. They, it is very probable, feel the pressure of infidel argument so strongly as to be unable to retain any Christian faith at all, except such shadowy residue as this "negative theology" might leave unassailed. They may, in their intellectual search for truth, have lost various powers of attaining truth which intellects such as they deem feebler may retain. But the movement itself is one of hostility, and the manner of it is one of insidious hostility; and the movement and the manner of it seem to me to be no more defensible than the scattering of poison in the wells of a city would be defensible, and the defending of such an act on the ground of personal taste, or peculiarity of constitution, or the search after chemical truth. And therefore I am struck almost more with what seems to me the hardheartedness and exceeding unkindness of this book, than with its unsoundness. Have the writers considered how far the suggesting of innumerable doubts,—doubts unargued and unproved,—will check honest devotion;

and embolden timid sin? For whom do they intend this book? Is it written for the mass of general readers? Is it designed for students at the Universities? Do they suppose that this multitude of random suggestions will be carefully wrought out by these readers, and be rejected if unsound, so as to leave their faith and devotion untarnished; or that they will be lightly taken up by light and conceited brains, to the ruin of all humility and simplicity of faith, and the encouragement of all kinds of sin? Have they reflected how many souls for whom Christ died may be slain in their weakness, by their self-styled strength? Yet let me not be mistaken. Unmerciful as I think this book, I do not plead for mercy. Those who have the means of knowing must not be content with a religion on sufferance. The difficulties must be solved, and the objections must be met, when they are produced in a serious and argumentative form. When so offered they will not lack their answer. What I am now principally objecting to in this unhappy book is the random, and, as I think it, cruel way in which these things are thrown out in it, unargued and unproved, to the certain injury of the faith of many.'—*Ibid.* pp. xx.—xxiii.

The following observation is of great value:—

'Indeed, I believe that the true method of replying to such objections as these is not to waive the vantage-ground of assured belief in the great Christian verities, nor to consent to regard each "difficulty" with all its train of consequences running up into total unbelief, as an open question to be argued without reference to those consequences, but rather, holding fast the great affirmative certainties of Christian religion, to regard from thence these which then appear comparatively insignificant questions. It makes a wonderful difference in the apparent magnitude and importance of a difficulty, whether it be regarded as the possible entrance to an entire unbelief, or an acknowledged perplexity on the fringe or edge of a strong and impregnable faith.'—*Ibid.* p. xxiii. xxiv.

The first point which Dr. Moberly proceeds to exhibit is 'the 'uniform and continual consent, throughout the Essays, to 'eliminate from religion everything that is *supernatural*, whether 'in miracle, in prophecy, in inspiration, in narrative, or in 'doctrine.'

In the course of this portion of his observations, he introduces some excellent remarks on the fulfilment of prophecy.

In a passage which follows, on inspiration, we regret that Dr. Moberly, while speaking of the *possibility* of an apostle or a prophet being mistaken, does not sufficiently express that he is only treating the case hypothetically, as S. Paul might say, 'If I, or angel from heaven, preach any other Gospel unto you.' And we should have been glad if his space had allowed him to discriminate the sense in which Caiaphas and Balaam were prophets, so that the first, who prophesied unconsciously, his words being shaped by a power not his own; and the second, who uttered a word put into his mouth, which he could not understand, should not be confounded with Isaiah and S. Paul, by being mentioned in juxtaposition with them—with the evangelical Prophet, who saw in a vision the glory of Christ, and whose lips were touched with the coal from the altar, and the Apostle of the Gentiles, who was illumined with wisdom and knowledge

of the mystery of the Gospel, whose own claim of inspiration and authority is, some pages later, so clearly maintained against Mr. Jowett. A *mere* prophet might err .... but a prophet, whose writings are taken into the cause of Holy Scripture, and sealed by our Blessed Lord's own words, is not a *mere* prophet. It seems to us, too, that the subject is thrown into some obscurity by the want of any distinction between the prophet 'delivering a message,' and an apostle who 'had the mind of Christ.'

This whole passage seems to us to need reconsideration.

With what follows we entirely agree, and we conceive that Dr. Moberly has the merit of having pointed out what is really *the* weak point of the Essayists. He says:—

'I observe, further, that throughout these essays, the nude Scripture, the merest letter of the sacred volume, is spoken of as if in it, and in it alone, resided the entire revelation of Christ, and all possible means of judging what that revelation consists of. But this is very far indeed from being the case. Every single book of the New Testament was written to persons already in possession of Christian truth,—of the nature of which we have a great deal of evidence independent of those books. It is no doubt true that, as to the events of our Lord's life and His actual words, though they were so many that if they should have been written every one, even the world itself would not have contained the books that should have been written, and though the first generation of Christians must needs have been in possession of a great number of them, none now remain but those which are recorded in the Gospels, except a word or two in the later Scriptures. But with respect to the Christian institution of the Church, and its doctrines as held from the beginning and traditionally known, it is quite erroneous, historically and notoriously erroneous, to suppose either that literally they were founded upon the written words of Holy Scripture, or that they can impart no illustration nor help in the interpretation of those written words. It might seem almost childish to urge that the three thousand who were baptized on the day of Pentecost, the five thousand of a later chapter of the Acts, the multitudes both of men and women, the people of Antioch, the proselytes and heathens of Ephesus, Thessalonica, Corinth, received the saving truth in its saving fulness without either Gospel or Epistle,—that the apostles set up bishops in separate cities and countries, such as Jerusalem, Ephesus, Crete,—that some of them, as St. John, lived on long, and left behind them, not writings only which have their place in the sacred canon, but pupils also who themselves were writers, and were succeeded by other pupils, writers also, as St. Polycarp and St. Irenæus,—if it were not that our Essayists simply disown everything except the merest letter of the New Testament as capable of throwing light upon the New Testament and its teaching, bid the interpreter, as a first principle of interpreting, "disengage himself from all that follows," and thus obtain an unembarrassed opportunity of applying all the resources of a so-called criticism to discredit and destroy the written record itself.'—Ibid. pp. xxxix.—xli.

Indeed, it is melancholy to observe how the popular religion of England, after repudiating the authority of the Church and jealously rejecting all teaching except the very letter of Scripture, is now exposed to the severest shock by an attack upon the very Scriptures themselves, and that it has nothing to fall back on, nothing to stay itself by, when these Scriptures are assailed.

Christ provided a twofold stay for our faith, the Church giving its testimony to the Scriptures, and to the faith taught by the apostles, and the Holy Scriptures themselves verifying what the Church taught.

Dr. Moberly excellently illustrates his position by the instance of the Baptism of Infants; and proceeds:—

'It will readily be believed that I do not suppose myself to have *answered* this book. I have not attempted to do so. I have only intended to ask attention to a few considerations which seem to me to be of weight against the general cast of opinions which pervades it. There are a great many other points which I would fain notice, but that I am afraid of extending these scattered remarks too far. I should like, for instance, to observe upon Mr. Jowett's assertion that "there is no foundation in the Gospels or Epistles for any of the higher or supernatural views of inspiration" by drawing out the claim which St. Paul lays to "supernatural" information both of the facts and doctrines of Christianity in Gal. i. 1, 12—16, ii. 2, 7, 8, 9; 1 Cor. xv. 1—3; 2 Cor. xii. 9; cf. 1 Cor. vi. 25; 2 Cor. viii. 8; Acts xxii. 17, 18, &c. Also, I cannot refrain from remarking on some of the same writer's canons of Scriptural interpretation. We have already seen that he disallows everything whatever in the way of historical doctrine,—everything, in short, of every kind except the barest letter of Holy Scripture as throwing light upon its meaning. "The office of the interpreter," he says, "is—to recover the meaning of the words as they first struck on the ears, or flashed before the eyes of those who heard and read them. He has to transfer himself to another age: to imagine that he is a disciple of Christ or Paul, to disengage himself from all that follows. The history of Christendom is nothing to him," &c. Will it be believed that the writer who thus excludes all collateral light of historical doctrine, and ignores the traditional knowledge of the Church, "the pillar and ground of the truth," as totally devoid of all connexion with the interpretation of Holy Scripture, also objects to what he considers excessive interpretation of the Greek in which it is written; tells us that "there seems to be reasons for doubting whether any considerable light can be thrown on the New Testament from inquiry into the language;" considers that "the discussions respecting the use of the Greek article have gone far beyond the line of utility," and has the hardihood to say that it is an "error to interpret every particle as though it were a link in the argument, instead of being, as is often the case, an excrescence of style," and to acknowledge "either mode of translating the words Θεὸς ἦν ὁ Λόγος, 'the Word was God,' or 'God was the Word?'" What, it may be asked, is to be the principle of interpretation, if the discoverable mind of the apostolic Church and the exact examination of language are thus to be both discarded alike? "When the meaning of Greek words is once known, the young student has almost all the real materials which are possessed by the greatest Biblical scholar, in the book itself." Beyond this, "the interpreter needs nothing short of fashioning in himself the image of the mind of Christ. He has to be born again into a new spiritual or intellectual world, from which the thoughts of this world are shut out." Yet let no person suppose that the writer means by these lofty phrases any illumination of the Holy Spirit of God, any divine aid to be won by prayer, or indeed anything whatever of a "supernatural" kind. No: substitute the words "Sophocles or Plato," for the word "Christ" in the last-quoted passage, and you have equally the rule for interpreting Sophocles or Plato. It simply comes to this: a little Greek (not too much) and a strong self-relying imagination, and you may interpret Holy Scripture as well as—Mr. Jowett! Now, had this writer reminded us that the New Testament Greek is a Greek of a different age from that of the classical writers, had he simply

warned us that we must not press our Attic Greek scholarship too far, but study the Alexandrian Greek of the Septuagint, Philo, &c., in order to ascertain the exact meaning of the words and phrases of the writers of the New Testament,—still more, if, as the result of such study on his own part, he had offered us some well-digested observations on the use of tenses, articles, or particles in the sacred writings, he would have done some service,—but this talk about "excessive attention to the articles," and "particles being often mere excrescences of style," is of no effect except to expose the writer to ridicule. It sounds as if he had been accustomed to lay down the law to an admiring audience of "clever young men," and had forgotten that there were still "men in Denmark" who understood Greek.'—*Ibid.* pp. xlvii.—l.

We must not pursue this interesting subject further. We can only regret that Dr. Moberly is deprived of the leisure for pursuing such arguments as these, and fully developing the hints which he here throws out. What would the full vintage be if this is the gleaning of the grapes?

ART. X—*An Introduction to the Study of Dogmatic Theology.* By the REV. ROBERT OWEN, B.D., Fellow of Jesus College, Oxford. London: Masters.

'A FLIGHT of a couple of miles from Owlstone Edge to the 'westward, brings us to Hallowleigh Parsonage. Peep through 'the crack in the shutters. The old parson is asleep in his arm 'chair, for he is weary, and has been trying to wade through a 'light article on dogmatic theology in the Quarterly "Standard 'of Orthodoxy."'

A comparison of the date of this hoot of *The Owlet of Owlstone Edge*, with that of an article which appeared in this Review on the first of July, 1855, leaves but little doubt upon our minds, but that *we* are the persons who are partially responsible for this evening nap of the incumbent of Hallowleigh. Dare we take upon ourselves the risk of a similar infliction? We fear that we must: for there is more than one parsonage in England, and some of them are tenanted by men who can wade through papers even on dogmatic theology; although the task of rendering such reading *light* would probably have transcended the powers of Dean Jackson, or Bishop Pearson, or even of the great S. Athanasius himself. If the Owlet should be led to hoot again, we have derived too much of amusement, and (we trust) of benefit, from his remarks, not to listen willingly to such good-humoured satire, even if it occasionally seems to light upon ourselves.

Undoubtedly this study must to a large number, perhaps to the majority of readers, appear dry; and even at best it is the study but of one single branch of theology. Far from wishing to ignore this latter position, we plead for it, we insist upon it. To consider dogma as all in all, or to give to it an undue prominence at the expense of devotional, exegetical, or moral theology, would prove to be as fatal an error as to neglect it altogether. Why, then, do we recur to the subject?

We answer, in the language which we employed nearly five years since, that our choice of theme arises from the conviction of 'a tendency to revolt against dogma in religion, to deny 'its use, its soundness, its possibility; and that such a tendency 'is, in our judgment, fraught with danger, most imminent danger 'to the cause of religion at large.' And yet, in reprinting these words, we must not be understood to intimate that the cause which we maintain has lost in the interval which has

elapsed since they were written. Hard as it must be to form a correct estimate, our impression is that it has, upon the whole, most decidedly gained. There is, in the first place, the work which we have placed at the head of this article; a truly valuable volume, displaying much original research and independent thought. And if one very favourite edition of the New Testament is somewhat un-dogmatic (we will not say anti-dogmatic) in its tone; if another—happily, we believe, of no great influence—is bitterly sarcastic against dogmatic theology; yet the admirable commentaries of Professor Ellicott and Canon Wordsworth somewhat more than rectify the balance; and we are happy to conjoin with them, in this respect, a work in a somewhat different department of thought, namely, Mr. Bright's 'History of the Church between the Epochs of the Edict of Milan and the Council of Chalcedon.'

But within this last year a more elaborate attack upon positive theology has appeared. The writers of 'Essays and Reviews' are, perhaps, more united in this feature of their 'negative theology' than in any other. On other topics it would not be difficult to point out many differences of detail, as well as of general tone. Thus, for instance, while Professor Jowett assures us, in page 419, that of yore 'the mystical explanations of Origen were not seen to be mystical,' Mr. Rowland Williams has kindly, and most justly, forewarned us, in a note to p. 65, that 'that great genius' *does* 'distinguish the historical from the mystical sense.' Mr. Pattison can tell us that, 'The world at all times, in all countries, can be described *with truth* as "lying in wickedness"' (p. 321); but Mr. Wilson seems to consider such a view to be an idiosyncracy of the loved disciple, for he writes (p. 169): '*With St. John* "the whole world lieth in wickedness," while *St. Paul* exhorts 'prayers and supplications to be made for all men, for kings, 'and for all that are in authority.' It is unfortunate that before framing this seeming contrast between the doctrine of the two apostles, Mr. Wilson did not refer to Galatians i. 4, wherein our Lord is said, by S. Paul, to have given 'Himself for our sins, that He might deliver us from this present evil world;' or, as some would even more emphatically render it, 'from this present world of evil.' Dr. Temple, in a passage of great beauty, presents us with a glowing picture of the early Church. But lest we should be carried away, Mr. Wilson again interposes (p. 159), and maintains, not merely that faults existed (which his fellow-essayist admits), but that 'neither in doctrine *nor in morals* did the primitive Christian 'communities at all approach to the ideal which has been formed 'of them.'

But in their opposition to dogma, they are (we repeat) apparently more agreed. Throughout the four hundred pages, and more, of the entire volume, we do not know of a single sentence which can be quoted upon the other side. We may, indeed, draw our own conclusions from a remark of Mr. Pattison's, that 'dogmatic theology had ceased to exist' in the eighteenth century. We may argue that such non-existence was either a cause or a result of that low state of religious feeling which this essayist so forcibly pourtrays; or, which is more probable still, that it was partially a result, and partially in turn a cause of the prevailing laxity. But such an inference, however just it may appear to us, is not intended by the writer.

We propose to consider the subject before us mainly in connexion with the Essays of Dr. Temple, the late Professor Baden Powell, Mr. Wilson, and Professor Jowett. We may likewise, if we can find time, say a word on some theories which have been indirectly educed by 'Essays and Reviews.'

We omit Mr. Pattison's Essay, becauses its notices of dogmatic theology appear to us but slight and indirect. Respecting Mr. Goodwin's paper, thus much only shall be said at present; that it is perfectly possible for a Christian to hold that there do exist some difficulties respecting the 'Mosaic Cosmogony,' and that Hugh Miller's explanation falls short of a complete solution, without necessarily impugning any single article of the Apostles' Creed. Consequently, we need not attempt any notice of the geological question, in connexion with our present subject, though a passing allusion to one point may be made in our reference to the Essay of Mr. Baden Powell.

The Vice-Principal of S. David's College, Lampeter, cannot certainly be exempted from our criticisms on grounds similar to those which exclude Mr. Pattison and Mr. Goodwin. As we lay down his 'Review' we do not find ourselves asking the question, What dogma has he attacked?—but rather, What dogma has he *not* attacked? Why then do we decline to touch upon his contribution to the volume? For several reasons. In the first place, if we should ever undertake a serious examination of the late Baron von Bunsen's theories, we should like to do it by direct reference to his own writings. Secondly, we might find it difficult to discriminate between the teaching of the German writer and his English disciple. Thirdly, we have a real objection to enter the field of controversy, without absolute necessity, in opposition to a writer of such temper. Dr. Thirlwall had the claims arising from episcopal authority, from age, character, learning, and ability. Yet even Bishop Thirlwall has been compelled to refer to this Lampeter Professor, as 'one who could find no category 'for those who questioned his orthodoxy, but that either of fools

'or knaves.'[1] And, lastly, the letter of the Bishop from which these words are taken, may, we think, be fairly considered to have settled the worth of Dr. Rowland William's lucubrations for some time to come. There is, indeed, one person who will be utterly incapable of seeing this, or of supposing that others see what he does not. But under such circumstances we follow for the present the example of the Roman poet's friend, Quintilius—

> 'Nullum ultrà verbum, aut operam insumebat inanem,
> Quin sine rivali teque et tua solus amares.'

Let us turn to our more immediate task.

We begin then with the first Essay in the volume, that of Dr. Temple. The following passage contains his declaration on the matter before us.

'From the very first, the Church commenced the task by determining her leading doctrines and the principles of her conduct. These were evolved, as principles usually are, partly by reflection on past experience, and by formularising the thoughts embodied in the record of the Church of the apostles, partly by perpetual collision with every variety of opinion. This career of dogmatism in the Church was, in many ways, similar to the hasty generalisations of early manhood. The principle on which the controversies of those days were conducted, is that of giving an answer to every imaginable question. It rarely seems to occur to the early controversialists that there are questions which even the Church cannot solve—problems which not even revelation has brought within the reach of human faculties. That the decisions were right on the whole—that is, that they always embodied, if they did not always rightly define, the truth—is proved by the permanent vitality of the Church as compared with the various heretical bodies that broke from her. But the fact that so vast a number of the early decisions are practically obsolete, and that even many of the doctrinal statements are plainly unfitted for permanent use, is a proof that the Church was not capable, any more than a man is capable, of extracting, at once, all the truth and wisdom contained in the teaching of the earlier periods. In fact, the Church of the Fathers claimed to do what not even the apostles had claimed—namely, not only to teach the truth, but to clothe it in logical statements, and that, not merely as opposed to then prevailing heresies (which was justifiable) but for all succeeding time. Yet this, was after all, only an exaggeration of the proper function of the time. These logical statements were necessary. And it belongs to a later epoch to see "the law within the law" which absorbs such statements into something higher than themselves.'—Pp. 40, 41.

The great difficulty of subjecting this passage to a proper examination lies in that extreme vagueness and generality which prevail throughout it, and which characterise the entire Essay. When Mr. Jowett speaks of 'the failure of a prophecy,' he gives

[1] A Letter to the Rev. Rowland Williams, D.D., by Connop Thirlwall, D.D., Bishop of S. David's (London: Rivingtons), p. 16. Cf. p. 31,—'What surprises 'me in all this is, not the imputation of heresy, whether as arising from the 'grossest ignorance or the most obstinate perverseness on my part; these are your 'habitual forms of discourse, for which every one must be prepared who ventures to 'express even a doubt about the correctness of your opinions; but,' &c.

us some samples of what he considers to be cases in point, and we are thus enabled to test the accuracy of the statement. But in the pages contributed to the volume by the Head Master of Rugby, no such advantages await us. The first two sentences are perfectly unexceptionable: but it is, we fear, impossible to apply the same epithet to any single one of these that follow. Certain portions of the dogmatism of the primitive Church resemble, it appears, 'hasty generalisations;' we demand to know which these portions are, and in what particular way they bear this character? Let them be distinctly pointed out that we may review and re-consider them. Is it the condemnation of Macedonius, or the use of the word Hypostasis, or the recognition of heretical baptism; or, if none of all these, what then is it? We pause for a reply; only observing in the meantime, that it seems scarcely fair towards the memory of Christians of those centuries, or towards the religious instincts of Christians of our own century, that they should be told in general terms that there is something wrong, without having it distinctly specified. The early Church is being arraigned in some way as a criminal, and we are compelled for the moment to feel with Porcius Festus, 'Of whom I have no certain thing to write unto my 'lord. Wherefore I have brought him forward (*προήγαγον*) that 'after examination had, I might have somewhat to write. For 'it seemeth to me unreasonable to send a prisoner and not 'withal to signify the crimes laid against him.' Primitive Christianity has a claim to the same equity which the Apostle received at the hands of even a heathen judge.

Similiar inquiries must be made with respect to a great deal of the subsequent phraseology of Dr. Temple's statement.

Which are the 'questions which even the Church cannot solve,' and which the early controversialists so rashly insisted upon answering? What are the particular decisions which (apparently) 'did not rightly define the truth;' and who are they who are prepared to furnish us with better definitions? Or does the 'negative theology' intend simply to lower our value of the inheritance we have received without so much as making an attempt towards supplying us with something better?

The sentence beginning with the words 'but the fact,' &c., gives two reasons for the conclusion which the essayist would fain draw. The first is 'that so vast a number of the early decisions are practically obsolete;' the second, 'that even many 'of the doctrinal statements are plainly unfitted for permanent 'use.' Our objection to this twofold basis of proof is, that the first, though true in fact, is not the least in point; and that the second is a mere assertion, depending for the present (until it be distinctly and specifically proved) upon the mere *ipse dixi* of the

writer. For it is surely no proof whatever of the slightest incapacity on the part of the Church of *any* age, to assert that the decisions which were made for a certain state of society, or against certain evils of a given time, became obsolete when that condition of social life was altered or the particular vices in question ceased to be flagrant. The council of Eliberis in Spain (A.D. 306) threatens severe measures of excommunication for some years against any mistress who treats her female slaves with excessive cruelty. So far as Spain is concerned, this decision has long been 'practically obsolete;' but does it in the faintest degree impugn the wisdom of the early Spanish Church? Under the dread of persecution some who lacked the heroic grace of confessorship, and yet shrank from offering incense to idols, obtained a false testimonial from a magistrate to the effect that they had sacrificed. But such persons, termed by S. Cyprian and others the *libellatici*, were condemned, as having practically given way to the force of persecution. For long ages that decision has slumbered: and yet in this, as in numberless similar instances, there is much to be learnt from the tone and temper of these enactments. Only, if we would learn, it must be by approaching those records in a spirit, not indeed of blind superstition, but assuredly of intelligent respect and sympathy.

'And you must love him, ere to you
He will seem worthy of your love,'

is frequently found true of institutions, as well as of individuals. The consciousness of a continuous life, of an inheritance of faith and hope, of affection for the selfsame objects, of a struggle against foes, differing indeed in form, but essentially identical; this is the secret of extracting wisdom from decisions that have passed, or seemed to have passed, away. Very beautiful, and very true, has always appeared to us that mystic Spanish ballad, which represents the Count Arnaldos as standing on the shore at sunrise, and gazing on a stately galley, which is gloriously appareled, and whence a greyhaired sailor pours forth a magic song that hushes the deep. Eager to learn the secret of that strain, the Count implores the sailor, as the vessel is gliding by, to impart its words:—

To him that mariner replied,
In a courteous tone, but free;
'I never sing that song,' he cried,
'But to one who sails with me.'

So must it ever be unto the end of time: those, and those alone, will hear the fulness of the melody, and catch the meaning of the words, who throw their lot with the mariners and risk with them the perils of the voyage!

And as regards the second reason given, viz.: 'that many of 'the doctrinal statements are plainly unfitted for permanent 'use,' we again demand to be told which these are, and why the case is so extremely plain against them. Are we to interpret the vague generalities of the first Essay in this volume by the more definite accusations of the last? If so, we shall have something to urge before we have done; if not, we are precluded from attempting to grapple with such cloud-like and evanescent phantoms.

We shall presently lay before the reader some extracts from a work of a very different character, which seems to us to have answered in a great measure, by anticipation, the general drift of Dr. Temple's argument. But we must first direct the attention of our readers to one leading topic which demands their deep and earnest consideration.

That topic is not immediately concerned with Dr. Temple's strange (and, as we believe, most false) assertion, that the controversies of the first ages of Christianity recognised the principle 'of giving an answer to every imaginable question.' Such a principle was, indeed, very congenial to the mind of heresy, more especially of Arian heresy, but it was from the first repugnant to the temper of the Catholic Church, which, while deeply conscious of the absolute necessity laid upon her, to 'earnestly contend for the faith once for all delivered unto the saints,'[1] and to give replies to such queries as imperatively demanded an answer, yet in every possible way discouraged the vain questionings of a philosophy falsely so called. Let those, who doubt the correctness of our statements, study with care the history of the Council of Nice, let them reflect on the speech which Gelasius of Cyzicum, in the true spirit of primitive Catholicity, puts into the mouth of one who is arguing with a heathen apologist for Arius, 'O my friend, we have already warned you, once 'for all, that when divine mysteries are concerned, you must 'never ask the *wherefore* and the *how*.'[2]

Nor do we wish to linger over the assumed absorption of primitive statements of doctrine 'into something higher than themselves.' When the seven Essayists have drawn up their new confession of faith, which is to supersede the old-fashioned forms of Nicæa; when students of theology, who have been wont to read the rapturous eulogy of S. Athanasius by Hooker, shall substitute for it some kindred encomium upon the work achieved by that energetic protester against non-natural inter-

[1] ἐπαγωνίζεσθαι τῇ ἅπαξ παραδοθείσῃ τοῖς ἁγίοις πίστει. S. Jude, 3.

[2] See *Christian Remembrancer* for July, 1860. *Art.* on M. de Broglie, who gives the reference as II. 23. (*L'Eglise et L'Empire*, tome II. p. 23.)

pretations of formularies, Mr. H. B. Wilson; it will then be time for us, if we live so long, to institute a comparison between the various documents, and strike a balance of the loss and gain, if, indeed, such words can in any wise be imagined as applicable to this species of change. But, perhaps, the epoch is hardly arrived for the Church in England to look forward to the speedy loss of her ancient confession of faith. Not yet can she apostrophise that 'form of sound words;'

> τάχα γάρ σε κατακτανέουσιν Ἀχαιοὶ,
> Πάντες ἐφορμηθέντες· ἐμοὶ δέ κε κέρδιον εἴη,
> Σεῦ ἀφαμαρτούσῃ, χθόνα δύμεναι·

for true as may be the latter part of the sentiment, these triumphant Achæans are as yet unborn. But it is more than time for us to quit these negative descriptions, that we may dwell a little on the particular subject to which we at present wish to call especial attention. That subject is the nature and limit of human ignorance.

And, firstly, need we say that, neither as educated men, nor as Christians, have we ever wished to make grudging or stinted admission of the depth and extent of our mortal ignorance, in the presence of those vast mysteries of the world of nature, and of the world of grace, which encompass us on every side, which confront us at every turn. Far from being diminished in number by the wonderful discoveries of science, it must be averred, however paradoxical it may sound, that the blackness of this ignorance is in some degree intensified thereby, just as the shadows are deepened by the augmented brightness of a light. It is only repeating what has been alleged in this Review, in a slightly different connection, if we point out how the sanguine dream of Bacon, that men would one day arrive at the knowledge of the essences of bodies, not merely remains unrealised, but is positively fainter than it seemed a few years since. In fact, we find one of the first scientific authorities of the day declining even to enter upon 'the metaphysical inquiry as to the constitution of matter,' on the ground that it is 'a question which probably human appliances will never answer.'[1] A learned physician has assured us, that at least one provision of the English law is based upon the assumption of a clear perception respecting a point on which the medical science of our own day confesses itself to be wholly at fault. The like might almost be said respecting the favourite mediæval controversy concerning Traducianism and Creatianism; and with no less truth in reference to numberless problems in metaphysics. Turning from science to religion, we may refer to the

[1] Grove on the Correlation of Physical Forces, p. 136, 3d edit.

famous *Pensées* of Blaise Pascal, as containing one of the most elaborate recognitions of the feebleness of human powers. Herein, perhaps, lies one of those attractions which have so endeared the volume, not only to the author's fellow-countrymen, but likewise to Englishmen of very diverse temperaments; as, for instance, Mr. Henry Rogers, Dr. Arnold, and Bishop Daniel Wilson, of Calcutta.[1] An equally marked, and probably still safer, employment of the same plea against undue inquiry into mysteries may be found in the pages of Bishop Butler's 'Analogy.'

Yet, nevertheless, it must be reckoned among the miseries of our fallen state, that even good principles have their counterfeits. 'After the prophets, false prophets; after the apostles, false 'apostles; after Christ, the anti-christ.'[2] And just as there is a false charity, which makes light of sin; a false humility, which would destroy all self-respect, and which would have enjoined the apostle of the Gentiles to submit quietly to the lawlessness of the magistrates at Philippi, (Acts xvi. 37); a false justice, which is tyranny and oppression; a false mercy, which has more sympathy with crime 'than with the law of God and man unjustly violated;'[3] so, too, must it be declared, that there does exist *a false ignorance*, which does not savour of a real humility and reverence, any more than of a sound philosophy.

Nor let it be thought that the admission of a border line, which is waving, and at times obscure, in any wise annuls the reality of this distinction. For the same kind of indistinctness may be alleged, as Bishop Butler has well shown, in his Sermon upon *Self-Deceit*, with respect to several moral virtues and vices. Who can say precisely where strict justice ends, and oppression begins; at what point prudence becomes meanness or cowardice; or leniency, weakness. And yet no sane person would be deterred by such a difficulty, from asserting the reality of such faults as weakness, cowardice, or oppression; or from believing that he was justified in denouncing what he was convinced were practical exemplifications of these errors. In like manner the difficulty which Cicero and many others have acknowledged on this head, does not do away with the real existence of a false and a true ignorance.

One of the most common and obvious forms of this fault, arises from the disinclination of men (sometimes even largely

[1] The following dialogue once occurred in a discussion on some philosophico-religious point between Bishop (then Mr.) Daniel Wilson and a layman, a relative of the present writer. *Mr. Wilson*—"When you get home, just look at your 'Pascal, under such and such a head [giving a detailed reference], and you will 'find the matter fully settled.' *Layman*—'But I have not got a Pascal.' *Mr. Wilson*—'*Not got a Pascal! Sell your coat and buy one.*'

[2] S. Chrysostom. [3] Dr. Arnold.

gifted, and highly educated men) to believe in the worth, or even the possibility, of knowledge upon subjects for which they have no personal fondness. The historian tells us that the vulgar multitude hold everything unknown to be a marvel. But there is not unfrequently exhibited a state of mind, just as unphilosophic and equally redolent of a species of vulgarity, in which *omne ignotum pro absurdo* takes the place of *omne ignotum pro mirifico*. A living writer, who has in many ways, despite some extravagances, vindicated for himself a place among the few who can be called men of genius, once ventured to speak in the most contemptuous terms of the science of philology, and of those who cultivated it. The attack simply recoiled upon the fame and influence of its author. It was felt that a study which numbered among its votaries such intellects as those of Plato, Johnson, Gibbon, Tooke, Niebuhr, Grimm, Bopp, Renan, Max Müller, Donaldson, Ellicott, Ellesmere, Stanislas, Julien, and numbers more who are worthy to be placed upon the same pedestal of talent, could not possibly be the useless and narrowing pursuit, which it had been represented to be, by one who had never really made it a subject of investigation.

Somewhat similar, if we are not mistaken, was the feeling of Voltaire, with respect to metaphysical science. In his case, as in so many other like cases, this proclamation of ignorance appears to have been simply one arising out of a consummate and overweening vanity. 'Here is a would-be science'—so seemingly runs his course of thought—'which I, Monsieur 'Arouet de Voltaire, have never mastered, and for which I cer-'tainly am not conscious of possessing any very special aptitude. 'Now, as it is manifestly impossible that any true and valuable 'branch of knowledge should lie without the range of my powers 'of comprehension this particular study must be pronounced a 'fruitless one.' The fact, that sages among ancient Greeks, Hindoos, Chinese, as well as in modern Europe (witness Scotland and France itself), had not only believed in the reality of metaphysical science, but had deeply impressed the mind of their respective countries by their teaching, was not thought worth a moment's consideration by this brilliant scoffer at all that is lofty, as at all that is sacred, upon earth. Accordingly it is Voltaire, who somewhere says, that when one person is talking about what he does not understand, to another who does not understand him, *that* is metaphysics; and who writes at the beginning of his tale of Zadig, 'Il était aussi sage qu'on 'peut l'être; car il cherchait à vivre avec des sages. Instruit 'dans les sciences des anciens Chaldéens, il n'ignorait pas les prin-'cipes physiques de la nature, tels qu'on les connaissait alors, *et* '*savait de la métaphysique ce qu'on en a su dans tous les âges,*

'*c'est-à-dire, fort peu de chose.*' (From the manner in which these last words have been quoted by Lord Macaulay, we suspect that, despite his Scotch extraction, he felt a considerable degree of sympathy with their tone.)

But most of all has this false ignorance displayed itself in connexion with religion, whether natural or revealed. It sounds so very plausible, it appeals with such force to the state of mind of irreligious, or only faintly religious men, to say that it is really impossible to understand anything about the world unseen, to arrive at any firm convictions respecting it. Hence what must, we fear, be termed the earthy nature of the morality of Confucius, and its lowering effect upon the minds of the Chinese.[1] We are glad to recollect that the principle for which we are now contending, is admitted in a work which has always seemed to us to push the arguments derivable from human ignorance to the very verge of what is safe and sound; nay (if truth must be told) a little beyond it—Mr. Mozley's 'Augustinian Doctrine of Predestination.' 'It must be admitted,' says this writer, 'that 'there is a natural tendency, in such a strong contrast as that 'which has been described, to overwhelm that class of truths 'which has the disadvantage in it; and that minds which seem 'full of the clear light of apprehension and reasoning, upon the 'obscurity of the truths of faith, will be apt to suppose that they 'see nothing because they do not see clearly, and that they have 'a simple blank before them. And the natural impatience of the 'human temper will much aid such a conclusion; for men are 'apt to see everything in extremes, and when they have less 'than what they want, are instantly inclined to think they have 'nothing. In this temper, then, men set down the ideas belonging 'to religion, as not only indistinct, but as no ideas at all, but mere 'void; and urge that persons are under a mistake in supposing 'that they have anything really in their minds when they profess 'to entertain those truths—not having, as it is asserted, any *idea* 'of them. In this way, then, the deeper perception of ignorance 'tends to lessen belief in the truths of religion; inclining persons 'to set them aside altogether as truths from which our under-'standings are entirely separated by an impassable barrier, and 'with which, therefore, as lying wholly outside of us, we have no 'concern.'—P. 320.

The writer adds in a note, that 'this appears to have been Hume's state of mind with respect to religious truths.' We perfectly believe this: and yet it is worthy of remark, that Hume was far from not perceiving the difficulties attendant upon the

[1] We are not sure that we have Windischmann with us in our view of Confucius, but it seems to us capable of proof from other sources of information.

pursuit of physical science. Mr. H. Rogers and Professor Mansel have both called attention to his remarkable confession, that 'no priestly dogmas ever shocked common-sense so much as the infinite divisibility of matter with its consequences.'[1]

It is no business of ours to judge our fellow-men: they are in the hands of an All-wise, an All-just, an All-merciful Creator. But we do wish to set before our readers, so far as lies in our power, the means of judging principles. Still we are far from wishing to inflict on them any private conclusions of our own as a necessary 'standard of orthodoxy.' As has been said in this review before, so say we now again with reference to our own remarks: may God grant that they find acceptance so far, and so far only, as they agree with His holy word and will.

We proceed to ask whether this plea of ignorance concerning things divine is always accepted by the Divine Majesty. Surely it must be answered that there do exist forms of it that are *not* so accepted, but which are represented in Holy Scripture as the result of a judicial blindness. 'He feedeth on ashes: a 'deceived heart hath turned him aside, that he cannot deliver his 'soul, nor say, Is there not a lie in my right hand? .... For from 'the creation of the world His invisible things, even His eternal 'power and divinity are plainly seen, being perceived (*νοούμενα*) 'by means of the things that are made: *so that they may be 'without excuse* (*εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτοὺς ἀναπολογήτους*).'[2]

The arguments, then, drawn from ignorance, may, in some cases, be an insufficient apology for a faulty belief and practice. The sense of ignorance, rightly cultivated, ought to deepen our humility and faith; but it may be perverted on the contrary to pride and unbelief. 'It is to be feared that the natural impatience 'of the human mind would, in the majority of instances, lean to 'the latter inference. It is indeed true, and it is a cheering and 'consolatory fact, that we see a broad division among the great 'analytical minds on this head; and that while some have drawn 'the argument for unbelief from the fact of human ignorance, 'others have drawn from it the argument for faith: that to 'Hume and Hobbes on the one side we may oppose Butler and 'Pascal on the other. But could we expect that the generality 'of men would exert that intellectual self-discipline which these 'devout and reverential minds did?'[3]

We suspect that this last query must be answered, as the writer seems to intimate, in the negative. Yet, if even those

---

[1] Essay on the Academical Philosophy. (Philos. Works, iv. p. 182.)—Cit. ap. Mansel, Bamp. Lect. v.

[2] Isaiah xliv. 20. Romans i. 20. (In this last verse we have followed the version of the 'Five Clergymen.')

[3] Mozley, *ubi supra*, p. 321.

who were without the pale of the Jewish or the Christian Church, are condemned by the voice of that Holy Spirit who spake by Isaiah and S. Paul, what shall be said of the wilful ignorance of men to whom has been vouchsafed the marvellous light of the Gospel of Christ? If there be truths that are explicitly taught in, or may be clearly inferred from, the New Testament, then it is (we repeat) no real humility, nor reverence, no true zeal for the glory of God, and for the welfare of our own or others' souls, to disclaim our possession of the knowledge which has been graciously imparted from on high, to pretend to darkness where God has granted light. For, notwithstanding its reserve on many secrets, still the Gospel *is* 'the revelation 'of the mystery which hath been kept in silence during eternal 'ages, but now is made manifest.' [1]

And this is the charge that we have to adduce against Dr. Temple's Essay, in connexion with our present subject. Fully admitting, as we do, the exceeding difficulty of laying down abstract and general rules, which can be applied to establish the distinction between true and false ignorance, we yet claim the right of judging particular cases by considering the evidence in point, and by endeavouring to fathom the results to which the arguments employed would lead us. Let us proceed to follow out this plan in respect to the Essay now before us.

What *were* the principal questions to which the primitive Church replied? They are given in the well-known and masterly epitome of Hooker (v. 54, § 10). Was Arius right? No: for our Lord is *truly* God. Was Apollinaris right? No: for Christ is *perfectly* Man. Was Nestorius right? No: for Emmanuel is *indivisibly* God and Man. Was Eutyches right? No: for He is *distinctly* God and *distinctly* Man. To which we may add the question, Was Macedonius right? and the similar reply in the negative, on the ground that the Holy Ghost was no mere effluence from the Father, no mere minister of the Son, but the Lord and Giver of Life, of one substance with both the Father and the Son.

It is impossible to read over with care Dr. Temple's Essay, without perceiving the existence of some sort of dissatisfaction with these decisions of the Church of those days. 'Hasty generalisations,' 'right, *on the whole*,' 'practically obsolete,' &c. &c.—no one can for a moment suppose that these and the like phrases at all resemble the language of hearty approval and sympathy. The natural inference is, that the questions at issue are in reality considered by the writer to be among those 'which even the Church 'cannot solve, problems which not even revelation has brought

[1] Romans xvi. 25, 26. (Version of the 'Five Clergymen.')

pursuit of physical science. Mr. H. Rogers and Professor Mansel have both called attention to his remarkable confession, that 'no priestly dogmas ever shocked common-sense so much as the infinite divisibility of matter with its consequences.'[1]

It is no business of ours to judge our fellow-men: they are in the hands of an All-wise, an All-just, an All-merciful Creator. But we do wish to set before our readers, so far as lies in our power, the means of judging principles. Still we are far from wishing to inflict on them any private conclusions of our own as a necessary 'standard of orthodoxy.' As has been said in this review before, so say we now again with reference to our own remarks: may God grant that they find acceptance so far, and so far only, as they agree with His holy word and will.

We proceed to ask whether this plea of ignorance concerning things divine is always accepted by the Divine Majesty. Surely it must be answered that there do exist forms of it that are *not* so accepted, but which are represented in Holy Scripture as the result of a judicial blindness. 'He feedeth on ashes: a 'deceived heart hath turned him aside, that he cannot deliver his 'soul, nor say, Is there not a lie in my right hand? .... For from 'the creation of the world His invisible things, even His eternal 'power and divinity are plainly seen, being perceived (*νοούμενα*) 'by means of the things that are made: *so that they may be 'without excuse* (*εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτοὺς ἀναπολογήτους*).'[2]

The arguments, then, drawn from ignorance, may, in some cases, be an insufficient apology for a faulty belief and practice. The sense of ignorance, rightly cultivated, ought to deepen our humility and faith; but it may be perverted on the contrary to pride and unbelief. 'It is to be feared that the natural impatience 'of the human mind would, in the majority of instances, lean to 'the latter inference. It is indeed true, and it is a cheering and 'consolatory fact, that we see a broad division among the great 'analytical minds on this head; and that while some have drawn 'the argument for unbelief from the fact of human ignorance, 'others have drawn from it the argument for faith: that to 'Hume and Hobbes on the one side we may oppose Butler and 'Pascal on the other. But could we expect that the generality 'of men would exert that intellectual self-discipline which these 'devout and reverential minds did?'[3]

We suspect that this last query must be answered, as the writer seems to intimate, in the negative. Yet, if even those

---

[1] Essay on the Academical Philosophy. (Philos. Works, iv. p. 182.)—Cit. ap. Mansel, Bamp. Lect. v.

[2] Isaiah xliv. 20. Romans i. 20. (In this last verse we have followed the version of the 'Five Clergymen.')

[3] Mozley, *ubi supra*, p. 321.

who were without the pale of the Jewish or the Christian Church, are condemned by the voice of that Holy Spirit who spake by Isaiah and S. Paul, what shall be said of the wilful ignorance of men to whom has been vouchsafed the marvellous light of the Gospel of Christ? If there be truths that are explicitly taught in, or may be clearly inferred from, the New Testament, then it is (we repeat) no real humility, nor reverence, no true zeal for the glory of God, and for the welfare of our own or others' souls, to disclaim our possession of the knowledge which has been graciously imparted from on high, to pretend to darkness where God has granted light. For, notwithstanding its reserve on many secrets, still the Gospel *is* 'the revelation 'of the mystery which hath been kept in silence during eternal 'ages, but now is made manifest.' [1]

And this is the charge that we have to adduce against Dr. Temple's Essay, in connexion with our present subject. Fully admitting, as we do, the exceeding difficulty of laying down abstract and general rules, which can be applied to establish the distinction between true and false ignorance, we yet claim the right of judging particular cases by considering the evidence in point, and by endeavouring to fathom the results to which the arguments employed would lead us. Let us proceed to follow out this plan in respect to the Essay now before us.

What *were* the principal questions to which the primitive Church replied? They are given in the well-known and masterly epitome of Hooker (v. 54, § 10). Was Arius right? No: for our Lord is *truly* God. Was Apollinaris right? No: for Christ is *perfectly* Man. Was Nestorius right? No: for Emmanuel is *indivisibly* God and Man. Was Eutyches right? No: for He is *distinctly* God and *distinctly* Man. To which we may add the question, Was Macedonius right? and the similar reply in the negative, on the ground that the Holy Ghost was no mere effluence from the Father, no mere minister of the Son, but the Lord and Giver of Life, of one substance with both the Father and the Son.

It is impossible to read over with care Dr. Temple's Essay, without perceiving the existence of some sort of dissatisfaction with these decisions of the Church of those days. 'Hasty generalisations,' 'right, *on the whole*,' 'practically obsolete,' &c. &c.—no one can for a moment suppose that these and the like phrases at all resemble the language of hearty approval and sympathy. The natural inference is, that the questions at issue are in reality considered by the writer to be among those 'which even the Church 'cannot solve, problems which not even revelation has brought

[1] Romans xvi. 25, 26. (Version of the 'Five Clergymen.')

pursuit of physical science. Mr. H. Rogers and Professor Mansel have both called attention to his remarkable confession, that 'no priestly dogmas ever shocked common-sense so much as the infinite divisibility of matter with its consequences.'[1]

It is no business of ours to judge our fellow-men: they are in the hands of an All-wise, an All-just, an All-merciful Creator. But we do wish to set before our readers, so far as lies in our power, the means of judging principles. Still we are far from wishing to inflict on them any private conclusions of our own as a necessary 'standard of orthodoxy.' As has been said in this review before, so say we now again with reference to our own remarks: may God grant that they find acceptance so far, and so far only, as they agree with His holy word and will.

We proceed to ask whether this plea of ignorance concerning things divine is always accepted by the Divine Majesty. Surely it must be answered that there do exist forms of it that are *not* so accepted, but which are represented in Holy Scripture as the result of a judicial blindness. 'He feedeth on ashes: a 'deceived heart hath turned him aside, that he cannot deliver his 'soul, nor say, Is there not a lie in my right hand? .... For from 'the creation of the world His invisible things, even His eternal 'power and divinity are plainly seen, being perceived (*νοούμενα*) 'by means of the things that are made: *so that they may be* '*without excuse* (*εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτοὺς ἀναπολογήτους*).'[2]

The arguments, then, drawn from ignorance, may, in some cases, be an insufficient apology for a faulty belief and practice. The sense of ignorance, rightly cultivated, ought to deepen our humility and faith; but it may be perverted on the contrary to pride and unbelief. 'It is to be feared that the natural impatience 'of the human mind would, in the majority of instances, lean to 'the latter inference. It is indeed true, and it is a cheering and 'consolatory fact, that we see a broad division among the great 'analytical minds on this head; and that while some have drawn 'the argument for unbelief from the fact of human ignorance, 'others have drawn from it the argument for faith: that to 'Hume and Hobbes on the one side we may oppose Butler and 'Pascal on the other. But could we expect that the generality 'of men would exert that intellectual self-discipline which these 'devout and reverential minds did?'[3]

We suspect that this last query must be answered, as the writer seems to intimate, in the negative. Yet, if even those

---

[1] Essay on the Academical Philosophy. (Philos. Works, iv. p. 182.)—Cit. ap. Mansel, Bamp. Lect. v.

[2] Isaiah xliv. 20. Romans i. 20. (In this last verse we have followed the version of the 'Five Clergymen.')

[3] Mozley, *ubi supra*, p. 321.

who were without the pale of the Jewish or the Christian Church, are condemned by the voice of that Holy Spirit who spake by Isaiah and S. Paul, what shall be said of the wilful ignorance of men to whom has been vouchsafed the marvellous light of the Gospel of Christ? If there be truths that are explicitly taught in, or may be clearly inferred from, the New Testament, then it is (we repeat) no real humility, nor reverence, no true zeal for the glory of God, and for the welfare of our own or others' souls, to disclaim our possession of the knowledge which has been graciously imparted from on high, to pretend to darkness where God has granted light. For, notwithstanding its reserve on many secrets, still the Gospel *is* 'the revelation 'of the mystery which hath been kept in silence during eternal 'ages, but now is made manifest.' [1]

And this is the charge that we have to adduce against Dr. Temple's Essay, in connexion with our present subject. Fully admitting, as we do, the exceeding difficulty of laying down abstract and general rules, which can be applied to establish the distinction between true and false ignorance, we yet claim the right of judging particular cases by considering the evidence in point, and by endeavouring to fathom the results to which the arguments employed would lead us. Let us proceed to follow out this plan in respect to the Essay now before us.

What *were* the principal questions to which the primitive Church replied? They are given in the well-known and masterly epitome of Hooker (v. 54, § 10). Was Arius right? No: for our Lord is *truly* God. Was Apollinaris right? No: for Christ is *perfectly* Man. Was Nestorius right? No: for Emmanuel is *indivisibly* God and Man. Was Eutyches right? No: for He is *distinctly* God and *distinctly* Man. To which we may add the question, Was Macedonius right? and the similar reply in the negative, on the ground that the Holy Ghost was no mere effluence from the Father, no mere minister of the Son, but the Lord and Giver of Life, of one substance with both the Father and the Son.

It is impossible to read over with care Dr. Temple's Essay, without perceiving the existence of some sort of dissatisfaction with these decisions of the Church of those days. 'Hasty generalisations,' 'right, *on the whole*,' 'practically obsolete,' &c. &c.—no one can for a moment suppose that these and the like phrases at all resemble the language of hearty approval and sympathy. The natural inference is, that the questions at issue are in reality considered by the writer to be among those 'which even the Church 'cannot solve, problems which not even revelation has brought

[1] Romans xvi. 25, 26. (Version of the 'Five Clergymen.')

pursuit of physical science. Mr. H. Rogers and Professor Mansel have both called attention to his remarkable confession, that 'no priestly dogmas ever shocked common-sense so much as the infinite divisibility of matter with its consequences.'[1]

It is no business of ours to judge our fellow-men: they are in the hands of an All-wise, an All-just, an All-merciful Creator. But we do wish to set before our readers, so far as lies in our power, the means of judging principles. Still we are far from wishing to inflict on them any private conclusions of our own as a necessary 'standard of orthodoxy.' As has been said in this review before, so say we now again with reference to our own remarks: may God grant that they find acceptance so far, and so far only, as they agree with His holy word and will.

We proceed to ask whether this plea of ignorance concerning things divine is always accepted by the Divine Majesty. Surely it must be answered that there do exist forms of it that are *not* so accepted, but which are represented in Holy Scripture as the result of a judicial blindness. 'He feedeth on ashes: a 'deceived heart hath turned him aside, that he cannot deliver his 'soul, nor say, Is there not a lie in my right hand? .... For from 'the creation of the world His invisible things, even His eternal 'power and divinity are plainly seen, being perceived (*νοούμενα*) 'by means of the things that are made: *so that they may be 'without excuse* (*εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτοὺς ἀναπολογήτους*).'[2]

The arguments, then, drawn from ignorance, may, in some cases, be an insufficient apology for a faulty belief and practice. The sense of ignorance, rightly cultivated, ought to deepen our humility and faith; but it may be perverted on the contrary to pride and unbelief. 'It is to be feared that the natural impatience 'of the human mind would, in the majority of instances, lean to 'the latter inference. It is indeed true, and it is a cheering and 'consolatory fact, that we see a broad division among the great 'analytical minds on this head; and that while some have drawn 'the argument for unbelief from the fact of human ignorance, 'others have drawn from it the argument for faith: that to 'Hume and Hobbes on the one side we may oppose Butler and 'Pascal on the other. But could we expect that the generality 'of men would exert that intellectual self-discipline which these 'devout and reverential minds did?'[3]

We suspect that this last query must be answered, as the writer seems to intimate, in the negative. Yet, if even those

---

[1] Essay on the Academical Philosophy. (Philos. Works, iv. p. 182.)—Cit. ap. Mansel, Bamp. Lect. v.

[2] Isaiah xliv. 20. Romans i. 20. (In this last verse we have followed the version of the 'Five Clergymen.')

[3] Mozley, *ubi supra*, p. 321.

who were without the pale of the Jewish or the Christian Church, are condemned by the voice of that Holy Spirit who spake by Isaiah and S. Paul, what shall be said of the wilful ignorance of men to whom has been vouchsafed the marvellous light of the Gospel of Christ? If there be truths that are explicitly taught in, or may be clearly inferred from, the New Testament, then it is (we repeat) no real humility, nor reverence, no true zeal for the glory of God, and for the welfare of our own or others' souls, to disclaim our possession of the knowledge which has been graciously imparted from on high, to pretend to darkness where God has granted light. For, notwithstanding its reserve on many secrets, still the Gospel *is* 'the revelation 'of the mystery which hath been kept in silence during eternal 'ages, but now is made manifest.' [1]

And this is the charge that we have to adduce against Dr. Temple's Essay, in connexion with our present subject. Fully admitting, as we do, the exceeding difficulty of laying down abstract and general rules, which can be applied to establish the distinction between true and false ignorance, we yet claim the right of judging particular cases by considering the evidence in point, and by endeavouring to fathom the results to which the arguments employed would lead us. Let us proceed to follow out this plan in respect to the Essay now before us.

What *were* the principal questions to which the primitive Church replied? They are given in the well-known and masterly epitome of Hooker (v. 54, § 10). Was Arius right? No: for our Lord is *truly* God. Was Apollinaris right? No: for Christ is *perfectly* Man. Was Nestorius right? No: for Emmanuel is *indivisibly* God and Man. Was Eutyches right? No: for He is *distinctly* God and *distinctly* Man. To which we may add the question, Was Macedonius right? and the similar reply in the negative, on the ground that the Holy Ghost was no mere effluence from the Father, no mere minister of the Son, but the Lord and Giver of Life, of one substance with both the Father and the Son.

It is impossible to read over with care Dr. Temple's Essay, without perceiving the existence of some sort of dissatisfaction with these decisions of the Church of those days. 'Hasty generalisations,' 'right, *on the whole*,' 'practically obsolete,' &c. &c.—no one can for a moment suppose that these and the like phrases at all resemble the language of hearty approval and sympathy. The natural inference is, that the questions at issue are in reality considered by the writer to be among those 'which even the Church 'cannot solve, problems which not even revelation has brought

[1] Romans xvi. 25, 26. (Version of the 'Five Clergymen.')

'within the reach of human faculties.' Arius may reduce his Saviour to the level of a creature. The Church stands by with the Gospel of S. John in her hand, but the revelation contained in the opening verses of that work has not brought the matter within the reach of human faculties, and she must leave her children to judge for themselves whether or not they are guilty of idolatry in paying divine worship to Him who died for them. Certainly the Fathers of Nicæa might have acted thus; they might have abjured the proclamation of that which they had hitherto taught. We will not say that in that case their proceedings would have received the approbation of Dr. Temple and Professor Jowett, because we do not for one moment believe that the Church would have endured to this day, would have exhibited that 'permanent vitality' of which this first Essay speaks, if her doctors had thus proved traitors to their trust, had maintained that God indeed had supplied them with a revelation, but that they were totally unable to ascertain and to proclaim its meaning.

But they clothed the truth 'in logical statements.' True; but even Dr. Temple admits that such a course was 'justifiable, as opposed to their prevailing heresies.' Wherein then lay the fault? In the fact, replies our author, that they 'claimed' to do this 'for all succeeding time.'

Now if this claim were really made, it was not by the original authors of the Nicene Creed. It was not until that creed had been very considerably expanded by the Council of Constantinople, not until its excellence had been tested, in one shape or other, for 106 years, that the Council of Ephesus forbade the use of any other than the Nicene Creed; 'a prohibition (Mr. 'Landon justly remarks) plainly intended to check the 'rashness of individuals in making new Creeds, not to prevent the 'use of any other words, than those employed in the Creed, in 'order to express more clearly the sense of any one of its 'articles.'[1]

In truth, Dr. Temple's view looks to us like an entire misreading of history. It would surely be far more correct to say —not that the framers of the early Creeds imposed them 'upon all succeeding time'—but that succeeding times, having found out by experience the value of these statements of truth, adopted them for their own in preference to making new ones. Thus the Emperor Justinian decrees that the Canons of the first four general Councils shall be recognised as the law of the land *(legum vicem obtinere)*; S. Gregory the Great likens them to a four-sided stone on which the structure of our holy faith may

[1] Manual of Councils (Rivingtons, 1846), p. 238.

rest; the Canons of Ælfric say that they are like the four Gospels *(quatuor Christi libri)*; King James I. of Britain, remarks on their entire reception by the English Church; the Lutherans of Augsburg announce in the very first words of their confession, that 'the decree of the Nicene Synod on the unity 'of the Divine essence, and on the Three Persons, is true, and to 'be believed without any hesitation *(verum et sine ullâ dubitatione 'credendum esse)*;' the Tridentine divines prefix it with a similar introduction to their Canons; and a Christian community nearer home, teaches that the same Creed (with the Apostles' and the Athanasian) 'ought thoroughly to be received and 'believed as being proveable by most certain warrant of Holy 'Scripture.' To sum up in the words of an impartial bystander, the historian Gibbon: 'The consubstantiality of the Father 'and the Son was established by the Council of Nice, and has 'been unanimously *received* [he does not say *imposed*] as a fun-'damental article of the Christian faith, by the consent of the 'Greek, the Latin, the Oriental, and the Protestant churches.'[1]

A more recent critic, speaking of the Nicene Creed, in connexion with the late Baron Bunsen, says—

'The ante-Nicene fathers were precious to him (Bunsen), in contrast with those who adopted and wrestled for the Creeds, which we take for the groundwork of our devotions *I have no words to express how entirely I dissent from his opinion. If the conflicts of the first centuries had not issued in the proclamation of the Nicene Creed, the Church, it seems to me, would have passed into a mere collection of devout opinions; its various schools would have sunk into warring philosophical sects.* The Creed was the proclamation of a Divine kingdom, which was to struggle with the imperial kingdom in Constantinople, which was to keep up a battle in all ages with every form of imperialism, whether it came forth under a secular or an ecclesiastical name . . . . . *Not for an instant would I surrender it to the objections or arguments of Bunsen, or of all other objectors, lay and clerical together,* however much I may honour them; because I believe in my heart it will do the work which they longed to see done, and which their religious instincts, philosophical theories, even practical devotions, cannot do without it.'

This is not the language of a writer in the *Christian Observer*, or in the *Christian Remembrancer;* but is contributed to *Macmillan's Magazine* for March, 1861, by the Rev. F. D. Maurice. We may venture to assume that Mr. Maurice would not place the *Herculis Columnæ* of human knowledge at the point indicated by Dr. Temple. Entirely agreeing with Mr. Maurice, that, but for the creed of Nice, the Church's various schools would have

[1] The authorities for the above statements are as follows:—Routh, Scriptor. Eccles. Opuscula, tom. i. p. 368-4, tom. ii. pp. 8.—Hase's Libri Symbolici (Confessio Augustana).—Canones Concil. Trident. (Sessio III.).—Eighth Article of the Church of England.—Gibbon's 'Decline and Fall,' chap. xxi.

sunk into warring philosophical sects, we venture to trace what seem to us the probable steps of declension, on the part of a community which should have adopted Dr. Temple's views.

Firstly, then, suppose it assumed that 'not even revelation has brought within the reach of human faculties' the solution of the problem, whether the Son is, or is not, of one substance with the Father. The question has evidently become an open one; and (as all history tends to show) the majority soon learn to adopt the easier and lower view of *any* question that is open. The *second* step is that semi-Arianism becomes for a brief season triumphant. But the semi-Arian creed is simply a mass of irreconcileable contradictions. It taught 'that the Son was 'born before all times, yet not eternal; not a creature, yet not 'God; of His substance, yet not of the same substance; and 'His exact and perfect resemblance in all things, yet not a 'second Deity.'[1] The *third* descent is to Arianism proper. Yet here how to escape the taunts of S. Ambrose, S. Athanasius, S. Hilary, and other orthodox Fathers, that Arianism involved the worship of one believed to be a creature; involved, that is to say, the guilt of a formal idolatry.[2] There remains then, *fourthly*, the extremest form of Arianism, the Anomœan, which teaches, with Ætius and Eunomeus, that Christ is *un*like the Father in His essence as well as in other respects. And an Anomœan is surely ripe for the *fifth* degree, that of Socinianism.

And even this last position—which, by denying the divinity of the Son and the personality of the Spirit, throws men back upon natural religion, and surrenders all the advantages of revelation—is it safe from a further declension? One avowed ground for anti-Trinitarianism is the inconceivable nature of a Threefold Personality. But it has been pointed out that it is at least equally inconceivable how an Infinite Being should be a Person at all;[3] and that consequently, as has again and again proved true, philosophical Unitarianism may easily subside into Pantheism, or it may be into Manichæism, which is, indeed, only a species of Pantheism.

Then follows, inevitably, the position maintained by Mr. Emerson, and by many Orientals; that evil is not really evil, but only a lesser form of good. And again, as Hindoo philosophy maintains, since all souls are emanations from Siva, and parts of Siva, every act of man is an act of the Deity. But the Deity cannot really do wrong; neither can any part of the

---

[1] Newman's Arians, p. 318. [2] See Bright's History, p. 13, note.

[3] The possible use of this argument, which has been pointed out by orthodox believers, is no mere phantasy. It is literally employed in a book on 'Spiritualism,' published in America, and justly rebuked in an Irvingite tract (Liverpool: Woolard).

Deity, as the human soul. Therefore the distinction between right and wrong is but a baseless illusion, however necessary for our guidance in this present life. The practical results of such doctrines are, we understand, illustrated with great force in a German tale (by some unknown Lutheran of earnestness and piety) entitled, '*Eritis sicut Deus.*'

Here, however, we shall probably be met by a protest. 'Your sequence,' it may be said, 'is ingenious, and possibly 'even logically correct: but let us view the matter broadly and 'practically. Surely, as a plain matter of fact, no educated 'man in a Christian country does profess, that human ignorance 'is any excuse for refusing to form an opinion upon such a 'fundamental question, as the existence of a personal God?'

We answer by narrating a few facts. In 1844 died a young author who, whatever his faults (and we have heard him accused of immeasurable self-conceit) must have possessed very considerable powers of attractiveness: inasmuch as two of his friends, both of high literary standing, undertook to write the history of his life. The biographers were Mr. Carlyle and the late Archdeacon Hare; their common subject John Sterling. Mr. Carlyle gives us a portion of a long letter addressed to himself, in which Sterling criticises, with considerable minuteness of detail, Mr. Carlyle's somewhat rhapsodical book, the *Sartor Resartus*. After much curious literary criticism the following remarks occur. We reprint them with Mr. Carlyle's comments, preserving the italics, &c. of the original.

'All this, of course, appears to me true and relevant; but I cannot help feeling that it is, after all, but a poor piece of quackery to comment on a multitude of phenomena without adverting to the principle which lies at the root, and gives the true meaning to them all. Now this principle I seem to myself to find in the state of mind which is attributed to Teufelsdröckh; in his state of mind, I say, not in his opinions, though these are in him, as in all men, most important, being one of the best indices to his state of mind. Now what distinguishes him, not merely from the greatest and best men who have been on earth for eighteen hundred years, but from the whole body of those who have been working forwards towards the good, and have been the salt and light of the world, is this: that he does not believe in a God. Do not be indignant, I am blaming no one;—but if I write my thoughts, I must write them honestly.'

Sterling proceeds to speak of the want of peace; of the want of calm and cheerful reliance displayed by the imaginary Teufelsdröckh. He then adds—

'Something of this state of mind I may say that I understand; for I have myself experienced it. And the root of the matter appears to me: A want of sympathy with the great body of those who are now endeavouring to guide and help onward their fellow-men. And in what is this alienation grounded? It is, as I believe, simply in the difference on that point; viz.: the clear, deep, habitual recognition of a one living, *personal* God, essentially good, wise, true,

and holy, the Author of all that exists; and a reunion with whom is the only end of all rational beings. This belief ..... [*There follow several pages on 'Personal God,' and other abstruse, or indeed properly unspeakable matters; these, and a general postscript of qualifying purport, I will suppress; extracting only the following fractions, as luminous, or slightly significant to us.*][1]

It is honourable to Sterling to have written thus; it is creditable to the biographer that he did not suppress so valuable a page in a book which, we must own, has always struck us with a very deep awe. But the point for our present consideration is this. Here we have Mr. Carlyle, a writer of unquestioned genius, of very widely extended influence, applying, if we are not mistaken, precisely the same kind of language to the distinction between a personal God and a mere impersonal *Anima Mundi*,[2] as Dr. Temple applies to the distinctions made by the Church of the Fathers. They are, says Mr. Carlyle of the one, 'abstruse, or indeed, properly *unspeakable matters*;' they are, says Dr. Temple of the other, 'questions which even the Church cannot solve.' And who will guarantee us, that if we begin with employing these arguments, as does the Head Master of Rugby, we may not end with employing them as is done by this biographer of Sterling?

Ah! who indeed? In all solemnity we say it, but we are unable to discern one single weapon of defence for the position of Dr. Temple, which is not likewise, to a very considerable degree, available for the protection of Mr. Carlyle. But the *personality* of the Almighty is taught, it may be urged, in Holy Scripture. Granted; but then we maintain that the *consubstantiality* of the Son is taught there too. Neither of the terms which we have italicised occurs explicitly in the Bible; but the one is, in our Church's belief, as really implied there as the other. But you must admit, it is perhaps rejoined, the historical fact of numbers of Arians and semi-Arians who never renounced the name of Christians. True; but we cannot help remembering, at the same time, the existence of numbers of Gnostics, and of a vast array of Pantheists, in the early ages, in the middle ages, and in our own nineteenth century, who would have been most indignant if any contemporary should so much as hint a doubt of the justice of their claim to be Christians. And what shall be said of the Paulicians? Here we have the spectacle of a body of men calling themselves *nominatim* the disciples of S. Paul, making especial claim to represent his doctrine and that of his divine Master, and yet maintaining the dualistic principles of

[1] Carlyle's Life of Sterling, pp. 278—280 (edit. of 1857).

[2] 'Spinoza *may* have believed in a God,' said the late Mr. Le Bas to the writer, 'but it was a God that I should as soon think of worshipping, as I should of falling 'down and worshipping the force of gravitation.'

the Magians and Manichæans. 'The rational Christian,' says Gibbon, 'was justly offended, that the Paulicians should dare to 'violate the unity of God, the first article of natural and re-'vealed religion.'[1] But Paulicianism, it may be argued, did not spread like Arianism. No, it did not spread (unless we consider the subsequent Manichæism of the Albigenses as its offspring), but for this a special reason may be assigned. Paulicianism was well-nigh coeval with the rise of Mahometanism; the death of Mahomet having occurred in A.D. 632, and Paulicianism having arisen about A.D. 660, when the sword of the Arab teacher's followers was in its fullest vigour. And well can we accept the remark of a philosophic writer upon Islamism, who suggests that among other benefits which the Almighty may have designed to effect by the permitted rise of this religion, the overthrow of the infinitely worse errors of Paulicianism may have been one. For the Koran, with all its faults, never hesitates for a single instant on this fundamental article of faith. Its theism is a real theism; it does not, with Mr. Carlyle, treat the existence of a personal God as 'a properly unspeakable matter,' but, from beginning to end it speaks as, *e.g.* in the second Sura, 'God! 'there is no God but He, the living, the self-subsisting; neither 'slumber nor sleep seizeth Him; to Him belongeth whatsoever 'is in heaven and on earth.'

It is our objection to the teaching of Mr. Carlyle, that it would land us on a far lower level than that of the Koran. It is our objection to the teaching of Dr. Temple, that it seems, if pressed to its just conclusions, to bring us down to that of Mr. Carlyle.

And if this be, indeed, in our humble judgment, its danger, then we can conceive no possible circumstance which should induce us to withhold the expression of that belief. Not glowing pictures of the virtues of primitive Christendom; not the stern moral purity which breathes through this Essay on the 'Education of the World;' not recollections entertained by any of the Temple, who taught by example as an undergraduate, nor the Temple—*Templa quàm dilecta!*—who taught, by precept and example too, amidst the mountain ranges of the West. Ἀλλ' *οὐ γὰρ πρό γε τῆς ἀληθείας τιμητέος ἀνήρ*·[2] or again, in still more familiar words, *δόξειε δ' ἂν ἴσως βέλτιον εἶναι καὶ δεῖν ἐπὶ σωτηρίᾳ γε τῆς ἀληθείας καὶ τὰ οἰκεῖα ἀναιρεῖν . . . . ἀμφοῖν γὰρ ὄντοιν φίλοιν ὅσιον, προτιμᾶν τὴν ἀλήθειαν.*[3]

We proceed to quote, as we promised, from a book which speaks in a very different strain of the three Creeds:—

[1] Decline and Fall, chap. liv.
[2] Plato de Republ. lib. x. p. 595 c.
[3] Aristot. Eth. Nicomach. i. cap. 6.

'The most obvious claim which the Creeds have upon the 'student of the mystery of the Holy Trinity, is their excellency 'as *statements* of the doctrine. And were this the whole of their 'value, it would not be small. It is no trifling advantage to 'have the proposition clearly before us, though severed from the 'arguments by which it is established; to know, in the outset 'of our inquiry, that there is no mistaking the nature of the 'points at issue; that one thousand years, on the lowest calcu-'lation, have passed away, since those venerable symbols have 'received the slightest verbal alteration; that during all that 'time, they have drawn the line clear and distinct between 'the receivers and impugners of the doctrine; that they have 'left as little room for evasion and verbal disputation as any 'form of words can leave, and have built into close and 'practical connexion the *symbol* and the *doctrine*. . . . .

'Their extraordinary excellency, as dogmatic statements, is, 'in itself, a strong presumption of the truth of the doctrine 'which they contain. We must ascribe to Providence a success 'which far transcends merely human foresight. Who could 'have thought antecedently, that formulæ drawn up in the 'fourth century, would have retained their vitality so wonder-'fully, and rise in as direct opposition to the errors of the nine-'teenth century, as they did to those which prevailed in the day 'when they were written? Who would not have imagined, 'that philosophical and social changes would have so altered our 'method of intellectual warfare, as to render the old bulwarks 'against error no longer a serviceable defence? Surely there is 'something in this permanence which testifies not only to 'their clearness of intellectual statement, but to their firm 'hold on truth. . . . . They come, not as formulæ 'known only or understood only by the learned, which, at 'a certain stated time we are called upon, once for all, 'to accept or reject; but as parts of our worship, incorpora-'ted in our devotions, blending with our prayers. As 'the religious act in which we are engaged becomes more 'special and more solemn, *they* become more prominent also. 'We have the Apostles' Creed in our Daily Prayers; the 'Nicene Creed attends on the Communion Service; and on cer-'tain more solemn days the Athanasian Creed, in its greater 'fulness and expansion, takes the place in the Morning Prayer 'of the shorter and more usual symbol. Thus they are evidently 'meant not as mere checks and guards against error, but as 'positive helps to devotion. They *are* of course directly opposed 'to heretical doctrine; and as such are insisted on in our Articles. 'But much more than this; they are to the English Church the 'framework of her systematic Christianity, the expression of the

'object of her faith, and the ground of her hope': a token of 'peace within her borders; a guard against enemies without; 'a free breathing-place for concord and charity. . . . . 'Without asserting any theory with regard to their *authority*, 'we may insist on the fact of their *reception*. We know that 'they have been, *substantially*, in the Church since the fourth 'century; that those parts of the Christian family which have 'displayed continuous life and energy, have uniformly held them; 'that they towered like a rock above the storms of the Reforma-'tion; that even now large bodies of men around us hold to 'them, in contradiction of their own principles, and profess their 'allegiance to the form, lest they should sacrifice the truth which 'it contains. Should it not convince *us* most strongly of their 'truth and value to find them harmonising so thoroughly with 'the remainder of the body of truth which has been committed 'to our charge: and, as we consider God's providential dealings 'with us, to observe how far He has put away from us those who 'reject them; how severed we are from them—to a great extent 'locally, much more in thought and feeling; how the whole 'course and posture of things leads us (and justifies us in leading 'us) to regard them as being as absolutely and unconditionally 'true as any really significant form of words can be? . . . They 'speak with a clear and unmistakeable voice; they give cohe-'rency to the whole range of Christian doctrine, which gathers 'around them as its natural centre; and they are written unmis-'takeably in the records of the Church, which is the pillar and 'ground of the truth.' [1]

We must apologise for quoting so largely from a single volume; but we know not where else to look for so concise a statement; and to re-cast it in a mould of our own would be too much like impertinence. And now, before leaving Dr. Temple's Essay, we propose to extract a few of the characteristics which he assigns to his *αὐτοάνθρωπος*, or representative man, in order that we may judge whether the other Essayists seem at all likely to realise the portraiture thus given.

'Lastly, he learns much by contradiction. The collision of society compels him to state his opinions clearly; to defend them; to modify them when indefensible; perhaps to surrender them altogether, consciously or unconsciously; still more often to absorb them into larger and fuller thoughts, less forcible, but more comprehensive. . . . But the greatest of his gains is what seems a loss; for he learns not to attempt the solution of insoluble problems, and to have no opinion at all on many points of the deepest interest.'—Pp. 34, 35.

We venture to repeat these words with a brief running commentary of our own. The representative man, it appears,

[1] Chrétien, Lectures on the Study of Theology, pp. 29—35.

'learns much by contradiction.' [It must be long, then, since any men have enjoyed greater advantages, in this respect, than the seven Essayists; and there must be numbers who earnestly hope that men so circumstanced will profit by their opportunities.] 'The collision of society compels him to state his opinions clearly.' [Such a result would, in the case of the volume before us, prove, in many instances, a decided gain. There is hardly a critic who does not join with us in complaining of the obscurity which besets a portion of at least four or five of the Essays.] 'To defend them.' [This very difficult task we can hardly expect to see undertaken, until the sale of the volume becomes a little slacker, and until some of the promised publications by Lord Lindsay, Professor Ellicott, and others, have appeared. We shall then look anxiously for the defence.] 'Perhaps to surrender them altogether, consciously or unconsciously.' [A consummation, indeed, devoutly to be wished in the case of a very large proportion of the opinions expressed or insinuated in 'Essays and Reviews.'] 'Still more often to absorb them into larger and fuller thoughts, less forcible, but more comprehensive.' [We have not the slightest desire to make acquaintance with any of these 'larger and fuller thoughts.' To their authors they may, very possibly, seem more comprehensive than the vastest ideas to which we have hitherto been accustomed; more comprehensive, perhaps, than the doctrines of the Trinity, of the Incarnation, of Monotheism. 'There is not on the east bank of 'the Rhine a philosophy which respects itself, which has not two 'or three trinities to choose from, and for which the incarnation 'of the divine Word in finite nature is not an habitual fact, and 'even the abiding mainspring of creation.'[1] We do not say that the 'larger and fuller thoughts' of any of our Essayists have as yet reached this Germanic pitch of comprehensiveness, but they seem in some cases to be far advanced upon the road.] 'And to have no opinion at all on many points of the deepest interest.' [This lesson, at any rate, is being rapidly conned by the Essayists. There is scarcely a leading dogma of the Christian religion, with respect to which some of the seven do not seem to occupy this position. Is it true that God created the heaven and the earth? To us, as to many others, the late Mr. Baden Powell's Essay seems to answer, 'I have no opinion.' Is the Almighty a personal God, or only an impersonal soul of the universe? Mr. Wilson surely answers, 'I have no opinion.' For he tells us at p. 153, in the very spirit, and almost the words of Mr. Carlyle, that 'as to abstruse points of doctrine

[1] M. Albert de Broglie, in the *Revue des deux Mondes* for 1 Mars, 1851 (tome ix. p. 916).

'concerning the Divine Nature itself, those subjects may be 'thought to be beyond the range of our faculties. If one says 'aye, no other is entitled to say no to his aye; if one says no, 'no one is entitled to say aye to his no.' We wonder whether Mr. Wilson considers that S. Paul was *entitled* to tell Titus to reject a heretic after two admonitions, or to announce to the Galatians his anathema against any who should preach a new Gospel?[1] Is there any single real prediction contained in the Old Testament? Dr. Rowland Williams answers, at pp. 69, 70, 'I have no opinion.' Is the Holy Spirit a person, or only the effluence of the Father? Professor Jowett surely says, in the plainest terms, at p. 360, 'I have no opinion.']

It is on these very grounds, because the Essayists write like men who would fain rob us, one by one, of all our convictions, and leave us in the mental position of the philosophers of the Academy, that we so earnestly protest against the effect which this volume, taken as a whole, is so calculated to produce upon the mind. Sure we are, however much the authors may be inclined to question it, that in repeating the Church's Creeds thousands and thousands, with us, repeat them not only with the lips, but with the heart and understanding also. 'For with 'the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the 'mouth confession is made unto salvation.'

On turning to the Essay of the late Professor Powell, and considering it with reference to dogma, we find ourselves confronted with a very profound and interesting problem, namely, the relation of theology to physical science.

Far be it from us, even for one moment, to imagine that such a theme can be properly discussed in the very few pages which we are at present able to devote to it. Enough, if we are able to throw out a few leading hints, of which we can most sincerely say, *valeant quantùm valeant!*

The immense fields of knowledge which are capable of being explored by the cultivators of physical science render necessary a division of labour. It is barely possible for the same man to be a high original authority, much less an original discoverer, in geology, chemistry, astronomy, and natural history all at once. More or less completely, the physicist is compelled to devote himself to what our neighbours term a *spécialité*. But hereupon arises a difficulty. The conclusions of one science are constantly interfering with those of another. A familiar instance of this truth is afforded by the supposition of a mere

[1] Titus iii. 10; Galat. i. 8, 9.

student of mechanics, who should maintain without reserve, that the Newtonian hypothesis of gravitation was never, under any circumstances, infringed. A very tyro in the pursuit of magnetism and electricity must know, that a piece of iron will leap up to the magnet, in despite of the attraction of gravitation. The general principle herein involved may be stated in the language of Sir James Mackintosh, who, after dividing science into physical and moral, proceeds:—'Even this divi-'sion, however, cannot be safely employed, without warning the 'reader, *that no science is entirely insulated, and that the 'principles of one are often only the conclusions and results of 'another.*' [1]

Let this be once conceded, and theology *may* prove to have the same right to intervene, the same right to modify the conclusions of physical science in general, that electricity has to modify those of mechanics, and metaphysics those of physiology. Such a claim on the part of theology has been frankly admitted, nay insisted upon, by numbers of the very highest names in physical science; such as Newton, Volta, Galvani, Davy, Abercromby, and many illustrious spirits among the living, as well as among the mighty dead. But it is idle, of course, to shut our eyes to the fact, that a large number of scientific men have either secretly or avowedly denied the claim; and that this list includes men of great mental power, such as Lucretius, Laplace, and but too many among the speculators of our own time. They would say, it is all very well for geologists to admit the claims of chemistry, or for anatomists to listen to opticians: but the claim of theology cannot be admitted, for this simple and sufficient reason, that theology is *not* a science.

Now with this class of men we decline to argue for the present. What Professor Powell would have urged on this score we do not profess to know; but it hardly seems probable that any of his colleagues would adopt such a line of argument as that just named. Indeed, an apologist for the volume, whose letters have been admitted into the columns of the *Guardian*, attempts to defend the 'Essays and Reviews' on the express ground that theology *is* a science.

But a modified view of the case may be put forward. It may be said that the very fact of a man being devoted to a particular phase of his special subject renders it almost impossible for him to contemplate even that one subject (and much less other subjects) from another point of view. *Non omnia possumus omnes.* The man of science must be permitted for a time to

[1] Ethical Philosophy, *sub init.* Cf. Professor Kingsley's Inaugural Lecture on History (Cambridge: Macmillan, 1860).

pursue his way, and leave it to others to enunciate the faults which they find with his conclusions, on the score of mental science, or of practical morality, or of religion.

There is much force in these considerations. They have, not long since, been urged in the pages of *Macmillan's Magazine* in a spirit of true, modest, and temperate philosophy, that demands our most grateful recognition. But on one limitation arising out of our present subject, we believe that, as English Churchmen, we have a fair right to insist. We claim the lawfulness of asking the votary of the natural sciences:—'Do or do not your 'premises involve such and such conclusions in the province of 'religion?' And, when a clear and definite reply *is* given, we may then proceed to consider, whether the religious tenet *seemingly* attacked be only a pious opinion, arising out of an assumed (perhaps hastily assumed) interpretation of certain texts; or whether it be in reality a dogma; that is to say, 'a 'fundamental article of saving truth, asserted or implied in 'Holy Scripture, taught by the Church Universal, and conso-'nant to sound reason.'[1] And if it be a dogma, then once more we claim the right to say, 'By this truth of revelation we abide, 'for the love of God and the sake of our own and others' souls: 'for your adverse conclusion we have no ears;—"Let God be 'true and every man a liar."'

A few examples will serve to illustrate our meaning. The great majority of scientific discoveries do not in the least degree affect religion. Let Paracelsus revolutionise medicine by daring to give poisons as remedies for disease: a thing not consciously attempted, we believe, before his time, though now, constantly practised on the most extensive scale. The anti-Manichæan argument, such as Southey puts into the mouth of his Thalaba, receives indeed a fresh accession, but (speaking generally) religion is passed by. Let Lavoisier begin to revolutionise chemistry; the reign of terror may pronounce on him the fatal sentence, 'The Republic has no need of chemists,' but a Davy will worthily succeed to the task. Religion is still left untouched. Yet one thought will inevitably occur to the mass of ordinary Christians, as well as to professed theologians. They cannot but inquire, whether it is reasonable for teachers of physical science to be so angry, as they often are, when believers in Christianity pause, before accepting as *final*, the

[1] We venture to repeat a definition given in this Review in July, 1855, just to show that we are not forging arguments for a particular occasion. The meaning of the last clause in this definition may be illustrated by the following words of the late Rev. Charles Marriott. 'Whatever men may profess, *it is scarcely possible for 'us to hold, as a portion of our Christian faith, anything in which we do not in some 'sort think we see reason.*'—*Preface to Five Sermons on Faith, &c.* 1859.

conclusions attained by sciences which are still in so shifting and uncertain a state.

It might seem unfair, while touching on this subject, to omit all reference to the famous case of Galileo. Now we need not stop to inquire whether any weight is to be attached to the arguments of living Roman Catholic writers (such as Cardinal Wiseman, Dr. Newman, and others), who plead that Galileo seems to have urged his right to press his scientific conclusion *as a formal interpretation of the sacred text*, though we may remark, in passing, that Dr. Whewell seems inclined to think that there is some real ground for this palliation of the Papal court of that day. But what we are concerned with is this: The *primâ facie* interpretations of Psalm xcvi. 10 ('He hath made the round world so fast, that it cannot be moved') and of similar texts, which *seemed* to speak of the earth as stationary, were pious opinions only, and nothing more. They were not articles of saving truth, nor had the Church Universal ever insisted upon them as such. To re-consider the *true interpretation* of Genesis, as the call of geology (when geology becomes a more settled science), of Exodus or Chronicles, or of particular prophecies, at the bidding of really trustworthy historical *data*, is something very different from resigning, at the beck of a novel scientific hypothesis, the primary and fundamental articles of natural and revealed religion.

Let us not, however, be understood to regard physical science as a ruthless enemy, and simply as an object of dread. We do not fear it, and we are not unmindful, that it often comes to us as a friend. As this guise is sometimes overlooked, we will just, at the risk of apparent digression, allude to one or two exemplifications of our meaning.

Modern science has very recently discovered that wheat, if sown under certain conditions of soil, in warm countries, does not reproduce wheat, but grows up in the form of a long grass. The condition of the growth into corn is the decomposition of the seed. Now Tom Paine selected S. Paul's comparison of the resurrection of our mortal bodies to the quickening of a seed of wheat, or other grain, as peculiarly absurd and false. It proves to be remarkably exact. 'If,' says a really profound man of science, M. Babinet,—'*if corn were not compelled to die in the winter*—if it were not, in botanical language, an *annual*, it would never produce those harvests which support so vast a number of lives.'[1]

It is a long-known fact of popular science, alluded to by poets —as Milton—that the axis of the earth is inclined. Voltaire

[1] *Revue des deux Mondes*, 15 Janvier, 1856 (tome i. p. 439). M. Babinet writes without the slightest allusion to Paine's objection, and is probably ignorant that it was ever made.

made this the occasion of one of his sneers at the divine wisdom, remarking how much simpler and better would have been the upright arrangement. The truly scientific man just named, commenting on this opinion, observes—

'It is unfortunate that Voltaire, when he laughed at the leaning of the earth's axis, saying it was presented to the sun sideways clumsily—it is unfortunate that he was ignorant what climate Jupiter has whose axis *is* placed straight opposite to the sun: perhaps even then he could scarcely have been perfectly satisfied. At any rate, it might have have shewn him that the ridicule he was casting on our planet was not very well founded, for it is just this "clumsy" position, as he calls it, which gives the means of life every year from pole to pole. But for this, our corn, which requires 2,000 degrees of heat accumulated during a certain number of days, would not ripen at all in Europe, in a temperature no warmer than March. As for vines, they would be out of the question.'[1]

In fact, Jupiter, in consequence of his upright axis, has, properly speaking, no seasons at all.

Some eminent French physicists, as M. Chaubard, and M. Marcel de Serres, have pursued researches into the nature of light. The conclusion at which they arrive is, that light existed in a diffused state before the formation of the sun.[2] Such certainly appears to be the teaching of an ancient book, wherein we read of the creation of light on the first day or epoch, and of the sun upon the fourth. Lord Macaulay mentions this Mosaic account of light being created before the sun, as a stock subject for the profane jests of the Deists in the time of William III. Perhaps, though the historian does not seem aware of it, the Deists may prove to have been slightly in a hurry.

Let it be further remarked, that as *a day*, before the creation of the sun, cannot be reasonably restricted to a period of twenty-four hours, it is, of course, equally possible that the word is not so to be limited throughout the chapter. A suspicion of this crossed the acute and devout mind of S. Anselm, in the reign of William Rufus, long before geology was ever heard of. 'If,' says the Primate, in his profound tractate on the Incarnation, 'if *those days*, in which Moses seems to say that this universe 'was not simultaneously made, *are to be understood differently* '*from the days we now see and live in*, then, &c.[3] Other, and

[1] *Ibid.* p. 442 (slightly abbreviated).

[2] Cit. ap. M. Nicolas. Etudes Philosoph. liv. ii. chap. ii. M. Marcel de Serres does not seem to be a biassed witness in favour of revelation; since, in the true spirit of Mr. Goodwin, he calls the statement of Moses on this head *an intuition of genius*.

[3] 'Si autem .... *et dies illi*, in quibus Moyses istum mundum non simul factum esse videtur dicere, *aliter sunt intelligendi, quàm sicut videmus istos dies*, in quibus vivimus.'—*Cur Deus Homo* (lib. i. cap. xviii.). We have never seen the passage adduced in this matter. For the references in the next note we have to thank M. Nicolas (Etudes Philos. liv. ii. chap. ii.).

much earlier, Fathers had spoken to the same effect more distinctly. Thus Origen evidently implies it in two passages of his extant works, and (we believe) S. Athanasius, and, most explicitly, S. Augustine. A few words from the last-named deserve to be quoted. 'Forasmuch as we cannot, in this our 'earthly mortality, experience and perceive that day (Gen. ii 5), 'or those days, which are counted in repetition, and if we can at 'all attain to understanding them, we ought not to venture 'hastily on a rash opinion (*non debemus temerariam præcipitare 'sententiam*), as if no more fitting and probable opinion could be 'advanced; we may believe that those seven days which now 'make up a week . . . in such sort represent those days of 'creation, that we need not in the least to hesitate to think that 'they are not like them, but extremely different (*ut non eos illis 'similes, sed multùm impares minimè dubitemus*).'[1]

This list might be extended. We might allude, for instance, to the discovery of the identity of all human blood, and the difference of its composition from that of animals, in connexion with the apostle's speech at Athens: 'He hath made *of one blood* all nations of men.' But we forbear. Indeed, our only excuse for this digression is the wish not to be one-sided in these very cursory remarks on physical science.

We turn to one of the most striking illustrations of its relation to dogma, namely, the hypothesis of Mr. Darwin.

And, firstly, let us confess that we do not feel that extreme dread of the *results* of this hypothesis which has been expressed in certain quarters. Just as the practitioners of the regular school of medicine may have learnt something from those theories of homœopathy and hydropathy which they denounce as quasi-heretical; even so, too, do we imagine it to be very possible, that the rejection of Mr. Darwin's view in its extreme form may prove compatible with a belief that the number of original species in the animal and vegetable world has been supposed to be very much larger than it really is. Even already we find Professor Henslow appearing to consider this view 'a stumble *in the right direction*,' though 'faulty in its general conclusions,' and his connexion Mr. Jenyns, writing to him, 'like 'myself, you may go the length of imagining that *many of 'the smaller groups, both of animals and plants, may at some re-'mote period have had a common parentage.*'[2]

---

[1] Origen, *De Principiis*, lib. iv. § 16; *Cont. Cels.* lib. vi. 50, 51. S. August. (the passage given above) *De Genesi ad litteram*, lib. iv. cap. xxvii. § 44. We are not sure that these passages have not already appeared in Dr. Buckland's Bridgwater Treatise.

[2] *Macmillan's Magazine*, No. 16, February 1861 (p. 336).

Mr. Jenyns continues: 'I do not, with some, say that the 'whole of his theory cannot be true—but that it is very far 'from being proved; and I doubt its ever being possible to 'prove it.' Here we pause; we *do* say that Mr. Darwin's hypothesis, *if we understand it aright*, cannot as a whole be true; because we believe it to be, in its totality, at variance with the very first principles both of natural and revealed religion. To make out clearly, whether we do understand it aright, we should have to request from some of its supporters a plain and unmistakeable answer to certain queries. To put forth these queries on our own behalf, as students of theology, might, we are well aware, subject us in some quarters to those hard insinuations of bigotry, priestcraft, hatred of knowledge, &c. &c., with which we are all so familiar. But it may be permitted to make such inquiries in the words of the *Athenæum*, a journal most devoted to the interests of science, and not usually charged with an undue bias for the conclusions of divines. We reprint the passage from that journal, precisely as it stands, simply italicising a few of the sentences which are most pertinent to our present theme.

'With Mr. Darwin's volume in our hands, we have more than once seriously mused upon the author's ulterior aim. What, we have said to ourselves, could be his high and dominant purpose in devoting so many years to such a volume as this, and in preparing a more elaborate sequel to this forerunner? What is his ultimate philosophy—for a man so meditative and so cultivated cannot be without one—and what would he wish his readers to hold as the lofty issue of his theoretic teachings? What does he really mean, for instance, by this Natural Selection, to which so much is attributed? If it operates as a presiding principle through innumerable ages,—if it selects, assorts, distinguishes and preserves,—if it gathers up manifold small increments, and rejects parts obsolete and unsuitable,—if it aggrandizes small increments into great and long-enduring results,—if it exercises a power that never fails, that is never hindered and never weakened,—if it foresees its end through millions of years, and through all these years is ever controlling imperfection and contributing to perfection,—and we think we find all these potencies variously, though vaguely, ascribed by Mr. Darwin to his supposed principle,—*if, we say, Natural Selection is and does all this,—then it is either God, or it is a pestilent abstraction. If it be God, why not say so in the plain language of many men? If it be not God, what is that you are attempting to set up upon altars where men usually worship him?* What is this wonderful power, to which you would give what most men regard as the inalienable prerogatives of Deity? *Do not reply that, though it exists, we can know nothing of it,—do not carry us back to Athens, where men ignorantly worshipped an unknown God.* What is its significance? Is it human, or divine, or organic, a substance, an essence, or a shadow?

In an age when all Science and all Philosophy are labouring to attain clearness and precision, it is certainly as desirable to have it here as elsewhere. Suppose us to be converts to your theory, and to accept all you propound, pray tell us, in perspicuous language, what we have gained. Apparently, you would have us believe that a wonderful and prescient principle is swaying the sceptre of the natural kingdoms, sustaining, conducting and improving all that lives

towards a grand natural millennium. You do not proclaim this to be the Infinite Intelligence, for you make it inherent in organized matter; yet, that it may accomplish what you declare to be its achievements, the Infinite Intelligence, at some vastly remote period of time, must have ordained that portions of his own intelligence should go forth at every instant of following time to things external, or to millions of beings whom you assume to be endowed with such powers of discrimination as to be continually electing and combining the elements of progressive improvement, and as continually excluding all that is unfavourable and deteriorative. There is a mighty march along ten thousand lines of life to natural optimism; but who heads it, who commands, who contrives and controls and carries out this astonishing advance? Natural Selection—do you again reply? Then, again, most certainly this same Natural Selection is Deity, or Fate, or nothing—unless you would suppose a duality of powers.

But if Deity, then the Creator. The Creator? What need of Him in this philosophy, which reduces Creation to a minimum of effect, and a vanishing point in infinite antiquity? A few primordial forms, unlike anything *we* have beheld, were, you admit, created, or, possibly, only one. Then Man was not specially created, whatever the Biblical myth may affirm. As to admiring the works of the Creator—where are they? These varied and wonderful organizations all around us are but transmutations or developments,—at least, none of them are special creations. *As to worshipping our Creator, how can we do so?* If your doctrines be true, then the only man who appears to have worshipped aright was Job, when he exclaimed, "I have said to corruption, Thou art my father: to the worm, Thou art my mother and my sister." Perhaps we may add the Egyptians, who, as they worshipped an ape, were wiser and more religious than men have hitherto conceived. That was not idolatry, but reverence for ancestry. Is this the key to the Egyptian sacredness of certain animals? Were those knowing priests transmutationalists? At any rate our most appropriate temple or heralds' college would be the Zoological Gardens. Let every man who passes the Chimpanzee or catches sight of a Gorilla salute his great-great-grandfather. The number of removes and the exact degree of consanguinity may be uncertain, but we are all lineal descendants. The likeness is not very flattering; but then *we* have improved, and are splendid examples of the blessed effects of Natural Selection. There may be a slight tendency to reversion, perhaps, but on the whole the improvement is manifest, and we ought to be extremely grateful:—

'Tis sweet to see the "human face divine,"
And sweet to feel the monkey's is not mine!

If Mr. Darwin, or his friends on his behalf, repudiate such inferences as these, then let them show that they do not follow from his theory when fully carried out. *It is vain to say he does not meddle with theology, when he comes behind it and deals out to it his deadliest blow.* If the general faith be, in his opinion, groundless, let him belabour it as he will—and the more openly the more honestly.'—*Athenæum*, No. 1723, November 3d, 1860 (p. 586).

Mr. Darwin, and Mr. Darwin's scientific friends, may probably decline to make any reply to such demands, let them come from what quarter they may. 'We are,' they may declare, 'under no special bond to teach theology, or to say 'in what way these scientific theories can be made to harmonise 'with its conclusions.' Into the validity of this plea, we shall not pause to inquire, because it does not immediately appertain

to our present subject. We are quite willing to believe what Mr. Darwin's friends say of him, that he is a sincere Christian, however *intellectually* inconsistent with Christianity, or even with pure theism, we conceive his principles to be. A happy inconsistency is no rare sight, and this may be a case in point.

But if we encounter a complete acceptance of Mr. Darwin's hypothesis, in the pages of a writer who has taken upon himself the solemn vows of an ordained priest of the English Church; and if this acceptance be avowed, not in a volume professedly devoted to physical science, but in one which is 'an 'attempt to illustrate the advantage derivable to the cause of '*religious and moral truth* from a free handling in a becoming 'spirit'[1] of the subjects treated—then indeed we are perplexed. Mr. Darwin, at any rate, said nothing about the cause of moral and religious truth. *His* tone seems to us rather to be '*Voilà la* '*science pure et simple;* take it or reject it, or adopt some portion 'of it, as you will.' But the Essay of the late Professor Powell, which at page 113 looks very like a direct contradiction of S. Paul, and at page 139 proclaims an unhesitating admission of the most extreme conclusions of this treatise on the 'Origin of Species,' what does it mean, unless it be, that a belief in a personal God ought to be regarded as an open question?

Readers who may not have the volume at hand, may like to see what we conceive to be the justification of our language.

And, firstly, as between the Essayist and S. Paul.

Professor Baden Powell.	*S. Paul.*
'The Divine omnipotence is entirely an inference *from the language of the Bible*, adopted *on the assumption* of a belief in revelation.'—*Essays and Reviews*, p. 113 (italics as in original).	'For the invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, *even His eternal power and Godhead.*'—Romans i. 20.

There is, surely, no tangible distinction to be made between God's omnipotence, and His eternal power (ἡ ἀΐδιος αὐτοῦ δύναμις); and is it not then manifest that what the Apostle announces as a truth of natural religion, visible to all eyes, save those alas! sealed in judicial blindness, *that* Mr. Powell affirms to be *no* teaching of natural religion, but only an inference from the language of the Bible? It does not seem easy to conceive two statements more completely and hopelessly at variance.

Of Mr. Darwin's book we read as follows—

'A work has now appeared by a naturalist of the most acknowledged authority—Mr. Darwin's masterly volume on *the Origin of Species* by the law of "Natural Selection,"—which now substantiates on undeniable grounds the very principle so long denounced by the first naturalists,—*The Origination of*

[1] Notice prefixed to 'Essays and Reviews.'

new species by natural causes: a work which must soon bring about an entire revolution of opinion in favour of the grand principle of the self-evolving powers of nature.'—P. 139.

The precipitant confidence of the tone is most characteristic of the writer. While (to say nothing of decided opponents) Henslow, Jenyns, Lewes, Quatrefages, and others, speak in a cautious and guarded manner; while even Mr. Darwin himself admits that the evidence derivable from geology is at present against him, Mr. Powell unhesitatingly declares that the object of his admiration *substantiates* his case *on undeniable grounds;* just as some ten lines further we are informed of *that enormous length of time* which modern discovery has now *indisputably* assigned to the existence of the human race. The impression left upon our minds by the Essay is, that the Church of God ought not to maintain any dogma whatever; but that the Professor of Geometry thought himself at liberty to dogmatize upon every possible subject of human knowledge, though retaining his right of reticence upon such points as that of the existence of a personal Jehovah.

We trust that we are not unconscious of the solemnity of such language when applied to one who is removed from human judgment. But the maxim, *nil de mortuis nisi bonum,* must find its limitation somewhere, unless there is to be an end to all true history—to all fair criticism. How can it possibly be our duty to keep silence respecting the words of one just taken from amongst us, so long as those words continue to circulate in ever fresh editions of the volume that contains them? On the writer we pass no moral or religious judgment whatever. What peculiar temptations he may have lain under, what palliations in his temperament or circumstances, in the tone of his age, or of those immediately around, may have existed, we do not pretend even to conjecture, for they lie beyond the reach of human ken. Far be it from us to forget who it is that has said, 'Judge not, that ye be not judged:' 'Blessed are the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy.' But to the reasonings of this Essay, abstractedly considered, we cannot afford to be tolerant; because we fear that they are so likely to issue in conclusions dishonouring to the Majesty of God, and fraught with danger of everlasting evil to souls for whom Christ died.[1]

[1] Since writing the above, we have found a paper, accidentally mislaid by us, viz.—Mr. Fawcett's able account of Mr. Darwin's hypothesis, in *Macmillan's Magazine* for December, 1860. It is with sincere satisfaction that we cite the following words from Mr. Fawcett:—'Those who, like Mr. Darwin, endeavour to 'explain the laws which regulate the succession of life, do not seek to detract one 'iota from the attributes of a Supreme Intelligence. Religious veneration will not 'be diminished if, after life has been once placed upon this planet by the will of 'the Creator, finite man is able to discover laws so simple that we can understand

To refresh our spirits, as we quit this Essay, let us repeat the well-known words in which Sir Isaac Newton in his *Principia* speaks of God. 'He is eternal and infinite, He can accomplish 'all, and knows all that is; He endures from eternity to eternity, 'and is present from infinity to infinity; He ruleth all things, 'and knoweth everything that is and everything that can be. 'He is not eternity nor infinity, but He is eternal and infinite; 'He is not time and space, but He endureth and is present. He 'endureth for ever and is present everywhere; and by existing 'always and everywhere He constituteth time and space. As 'each indivisible part of space exists always, He is the Author 'and Governor of everything in all time and in all space.'[1]

Here is at least no uncertain sound, no half-recognition of the dreams of Pantheism. The great discoverer of the laws of matter had not learnt 'to have no opinion at all' upon a subject of such deep interest.

A glance at Mr. H. B. Wilson's Essay will bring us back from science to history. (We say a glance, for it must be remembered that this article only professes to touch upon a single point, namely, dogma, in connexion with 'Essays and Reviews.') Mr. Wilson, at page 166, writes as follows:—

'the agency by which all that lives around us has been generated from those forms 'in which life first dawned upon the globe' (p. 87, 88). We cannot pretend to say that Mr. Fawcett seems to us to give a full and satisfactory reply to the queries of the *Athenæum*. There is not, for instance, a word from which we can gather whether Mr. F. does, or does not believe, in the independent creation of the species *Man*. But we gladly recognise, in a semi-supporter of Mr. Darwin's view, the admission of a Supreme Intelligence, and sincerely trust, that an entire supporter, such as Mr. Powell, may not have intended to impugn such belief, any more than Mr. Darwin himself.

Yet, at the very best, how different is Mr. Powell's language from Newton's! How completely has he contrived to create, in minds the most diversely trained, the impression of an intention to throw doubt on the existence of a living personal God.

[1] Compare a very useful sermon preached at Oxford in January 1848, by Mr. Garbett, entitled 'Modern Philosophical Infidelity; or the Personality of God.' A writer signing himself G. H. C. quotes on behalf of the Essayists (in the *Guardian* of February 20th), a passage from Dr. Newman's 'University Addresses,' p. 283. Who G. H. C. may be we have studiously refrained from even attempting to inquire; but he seems to us to have thoroughly deserved the reproof of W. B. (*Guardian*, February 27th) for his supercilious tone respecting the Church of the fourth century, and his want of fairness towards W. B. himself. On his citation from Dr. Newman, we have only to ask those who are able, to look out the passage for themselves, and read *just one single sentence* beyond the place at which G. H. C. has thought proper to stop. Dr. Newman has two interesting Discourses (III. and IV.) bearing on the same, in his 'University Education.' Although we have not been wilful plagiarists from his pages, they have no doubt left their traces on this portion of our article.

We do not wish to let our dislike of G. H. C.'s tone render us blind to the interest of his views on theology as a science. Nothing, but lack of leisure, prevents us from entering into a detailed examination of them.

'*Unhappily*, together with his inauguration of Multitudinism, Constantine also inaugurated a principle essentially at variance with it, *the principle of doctrinal limitation* . . . . . We cannot now be very good judges, whether it would have been possible, together with the establishment of Christianity as the imperial religion, to enforce forbearance between the great antagonisms which were then in dispute, and to have insisted on the maxim, that neither had a right to limit the common Christianity to the exclusion of the other. At all events a principle at variance with a true Multitudinism was then recognised. All parties, it must be acknowledged, were equally exclusive. And exclusion and definition have since been the rule for almost all Churches, more or less, even when others of their principles might seem to promise a greater freedom.'

We pause for a moment to consider the very hard measure which is dealt out to the primitive Church in this volume, considered as a whole. At page 41 the Church of the Fathers received permission to clothe the truth in logical statements, as a justifiable proceeding in opposition to then prevailing heresies. But at page 166 the liberty, which had been thus kindly conceded by the Head Master of Rugby is entirely taken away by the Vicar of Great Staughton, and by the time we reach page 420, we are informed that it is perhaps true that the decision of the council of Nicæa was the greatest misfortune that ever befel the Christian world. (This last opinion is given in the language, it is fair to add, of an English prelate: we presume a prelate who flourished since 1688, since it is rarely that any bishop of an earlier date is cited with such respect in 'Essays and Reviews.') But how rapid is the development of thought on these matters, when they are subjected 'to a free handling.' If the course pursued by a certain institution is first allowed to be temporarily justifiable; then found to be utterly unjustifiable ('for neither had a right,' &c.); then *probably* worthy of being stigmatized as the greatest of all known misfortunes, we cannot refrain from asking, whether it would be a *very* violent step in advance, if another Essayist were to suggest it as 'perhaps true,' that the non-existence of any such institution at all might have possibly been a fortunate circumstance for the human race?

To turn, for a moment, to the actual history. It should be borne in mind that Constantine did actually begin his course of action, respecting the great question of his time, in the very spirit so much approved of by Mr. Wilson. It would be difficult to state the case more exactly, or more concisely, than has been recently done by Mr. Bright. 'In a letter to 'Alexander and Arius, he [Constantine] expressed his natural 'longing for tranquil days; but he also exhibited his ignorance 'of the real bearings of the controversy, and his imperial self-'confidence in pronouncing upon it. The strife, he said, had 'arisen from an impractical question stirred by the one, and an

'inconsiderate opinion expressed by the other. Let them indulge 'no more in such intellectual exercises; or, at any rate, keep 'them from publicity. Seven times in the letter he insists, 'with a sort of passionate emphasis, that the points at issue are 'minute and trivial. On all vital points he assures them that 'they agree. Why should they rend the Christian brotherhood 'about speculative opinions on which few men think alike? 'Thus, in the spirit of a man of the world, for whom doctrinal 'truth was a mere unreality, Constantine threw aside, as abso-'lutely unimportant, the question whether Christ was very God 'or no.'[1]

We all know that this state of mind did not endure, but before long gave way to that which ended in the summons for the famous council. But let us, for argument's sake, suppose that it had lasted; let us imagine for a moment this *Constantinus redivivus* on his imperial throne, and by his side, not Hosius of Cordova, but some adviser who should prove the prototype of Mr. H. B. Wilson.

Well, the autocratic *fiat* goes forth. Arian and Catholic are to be recognized alike—

'Tros Tyriusve mihi nullo discrimine agetur'—

and neither has 'a right to limit the common Christianity to the exclusion of the other.' But when this law has been enacted, and, we will assume (a bold assumption), successfully enforced; then, in the name of common sense and common justice, on what possible ground is his Imperial Majesty to exclude Sabellius and his followers? No difference between the doctrine of Arius and that of Sabellius, antipodal as they appear, could be greater than that between the doctrine of Arius and Athanasius. Indeed, in one point of view, it was less: for Arians and Sabellians really did at times play into each others' hands, from a spirit of opposition to the truth—

ἐσθλοὶ μὲν γὰρ ἁπλῶς, παντοδαπῶς δὲ κακοί.

But if Sabellians, why not Anomæans? and if Anomæans, why not Montanists, and the followers of Manes and Valentinian? Well may Mr. Maurice exclaim, in the passage which has been already quoted, that 'the Church would have passed into a mere collection of devout [?] opinions;' that 'its various schools would have sunk into warring philosophical sects.' Such would have been the issue *if* (an *if* which we by no means grant) the civil power could have enforced Mr. Wilson's maxim.

The Essayist now before us is somewhat less vague and less inaccurate than some of his colleagues. He admits that 'all parties were equally exclusive.' They certainly were so.

[1] History of the Church from A. D. 313—451 (Parker: Oxford, 1860), pp. 19, 20.

Small as is our sympathy with the Arians, we have never thought so badly of them, as to suppose that they convulsed the Church and the empire for the sake of what the supposed to be a perfectly open question. Constantius had as little idea of this comprehensive creed as had his father Constantine. 'Instead of reconciling the parties by the weight of his authority,' complains the heathen Ammianus, 'he cherished 'and propagated by verbal disputes the differences which his 'vain curiosity had excited.'[1]

And was there no one to take a hint from the advice, in which this 'cool and impartial infidel' (as Gibbon[2] terms him) had anticipated Mr. H. B. Wilson by some 1,500 years? Yes; there *was* an emperor, mentioned in this essay on 'The National Church,' who did at first look forward to a moment (which never came) when, in the name of philosophy, he should impose peace upon the contending religious parties at Alexandria.[3] There *was* an Emperor by whom, as Gibbon relates, 'the bishops and clergy who had been banished by the Arian 'monarch [Constantius] were recalled from exile, and restored 'to their respective churches; the Donatists, the Novatians, the 'Macedonians, the Eunomians, and those who, with a more 'prosperous fortune, adhered to the doctrine of Nice.'[4] Yes! but that monarch soon showed himself in his true light. His toleration for all Christians was, ere long, converted into a subtle and intellectual form of persecution of the hated 'Galileans;' his wish to see S. Athanasius and the Alexandrian Arians reduced to silence was succeeded by an all but express command that the great confessor should be slain;[5] his zeal attempted (how vainly!) to contradict Divine prophecy by the re-erection of the temple at Jerusalem; and he is marked for all time with the brand upon his brow by the title of JULIAN—THE APOSTATE.[6]

We commend these historic facts to the earnest consideration of all those who are in any danger of being led away by the specious liberalism of 'Essays and Reviews.' We use the word *liberalism* designedly; for that true liberality, which is far

[1] xxi. 16, cit. ap. Gibbon, Decline and Fall, chap. xxi.
[2] *Ibid.* chap. xxiii. note 118.
[3] De Broglie L'Eglise et L'Empire Romain (Seconde Partie, Tome ii. pp. 247-8)
[4] Decline and Fall, chap. xxiii. [5] *Ibid.*
[6] It is worth while to quote Gibbon's account of Julian's sentiments towards *one* Bishop: 'Julian, who despised the Christians, honoured Athanasius with his 'sincere and peculiar hatred. *For his sake alone*, he introduced an arbitrary dis-'tinction, repugnant, at least, to the spirit of his former declarations. . . . He 'again banished Athanasius from the city; . . . the language of his resentment 'discovers the opinion which he entertained of the courage and abilities of Atha-'nasius.' (chap. xxiii.) What a comment on the well-known saying about the well-nigh infallible instinct of impiety! Julian was perfectly right as to the selection of his one really dangerous opponent.

removed from it as light from darkness, is not easily to be found in the volume before us.

It is true that in Mr. Wilson's case the utter indifference to the vital opposition between Arianism and the Catholic Faith ought not to take us by surprise. The Bampton Lecturer, who denied the reality of grace, as a gift infused into men's minds and hearts,[1] and who would reduce it to a mere external change of circumstances, had already begun to employ on one of the most important tenets of religion not merely Arian, but even Socinian modes of thought and language. But before ever Mr. H. B. Wilson had even commenced the delivery of those Lectures, the danger of such teaching in itself, and the deadly results to which it may lead, had been pointed out to the students of at least one college in Oxford, in the following remarkable words:—

'This is the ordinary language of Socinians; and, when used 'by others, implies, it can hardly be doubted, a tendency to their 'fatal error. It is one of the many stratagems which minds of a 'false and mistaken intellectuality employ, in the endeavour to 'escape from a sense of mystery which haunts and torments 'them. And as it proceeds from a dislike of mystery, it termi- 'nates, if followed to its consequences, in a disbelief of the most 'blessed mystery of the Incarnation of our Lord. He who 'thinks that our Saviour has wrought no change *in* him, will 'not long believe that He has accomplished so much *for* him. 'The denial of His work on earth follows naturally on a refusal 'to recognise the crowning blessing which He now sends us 'from heaven. If it is thought that His teaching has only a 'human efficacy, we must be prepared for a like indignity to the 'efficacy of His death. Those who reject Spiritual Grace, will 'not long accept the Atonement. But we need not look to 'consequences, in order to see the grave nature of this error. 'It directly contradicts the word of God. If there is one 'feature of the Gospel dispensation more clearly brought out 'than any other by the combined testimony of Prophecy, 'history, and Apostolic teaching, it is its connexion with the 'operations of the Spirit. The law written on the heart, the 'free effusion of spiritual gifts, the diversity of spiritual 'operations, the consecration of body and soul by the indwelling 'of a Divine Presence, all point to the same great Truth; that 'under the economy of Grace, there is not only a fuller external 'publication of truth, but an increased capacity in the heart of 'man to receive it; that more light is accompanied with an 'augmented power of spiritual vision, and not only are new

[1] See the Collects of our Church for Easter Day and the Annunciation.

'motives proposed to the Christian, but new strength is given 'him, that he may act upon them.'[1]

There are many topics in connexion with this volume which we would gladly have discussed, if we had time. Which, for example, among the Essays have any real claim to be ranked among the creations of genius; what probability there is that the book will live; what lessons we, who oppose its leading views, may justly learn from it; what is the value of the apologies so prominently put forth on behalf of Dr. Temple and Mr. Jowett. We should also like to explain at length the meaning of a paragraph in our last number, which at least one reader seems to have misunderstood.[2] But since we find it impossible to do anything like justice to the whole of these subjects, we can only hint at our impressions on some, speaking with a little more fulness on the others.

Passing, then, for the moment, the question of the ability displayed, and the apparent chances of endurance, we will say, through the medium of another's pen, one word upon the lessons for ourselves, contained or implied in the appearance and vast sale of 'Essays and Reviews.'

From one among the many gratifying letters, which we have received since the appearance of our last number, we select the following. The writer begins by expressing his entire concurrence with an article in the January number of this Review, and then proceeds:—

'At the same time there can be no doubt, I think, that the Essays express a general feeling of dissatisfaction with the stereotyped phraseology, not of the creeds but of the pulpits, respecting original sin, the atonement, grace, and so on. I know I have *sat under* men, very impatiently, I own, who have talked for their allotted half-hour the most utterly unreal stuff on these subjects, and spoken of states of mind which I knew it was utterly impossible they could ever have gone near passing through, even if anybody ever did experience them. Yet it was considered the right thing to say.'

Here is surely a just and valuable hint for any of us who have to teach. We must strive to be real, to mean what we say, and to say only what we really believe and feel.

Then, as regards the defences put forth. The friends of Dr. Temple keep reiterating the statement, that his Essay was preached (in substance) before the University of Oxford, and excited no hostile criticism. Consequently, they appear to imply, it ought not to arouse it now.

[1] Chretien's 'Lectures on the Study of Theology,' pp. 60, 61. We must again apologize for taking so much out of a single volume of only 120 pages: but we know not where else to look for a statement of the case so deep, accurate, and prophetic. The publication antedated Mr. Wilson's Bampton Lectures by one year.

[2] A letter on this point, from the author of that article, will be found among our shorter notices.

It is our earnest desire not to press conclusions uncharitably; but we must own that we are totally unable to perceive the force of this reasoning. In the first place, the lofty morality of such a discourse might well leave on the mind of a mere *hearer* a more favourable impression than he would derive from the calm contemplation of its statements in the silence of his study. What that impression is upon *some* minds may be augured from the subjoined extract from a letter of another correspondent, whom we will not trust ourselves to characterize, so highly do we think of his judgment and spiritual insight.[1] But if the Essay standing by itself lies open to objections, those objections gain unspeakably in force when it is coloured by the light thrown upon it by the succeeding essays. And to demand that our judgment of one essay should be wholly unbiassed by the tone of the others is simply to ask an impossibility.[1] Had the first essay been published by itself, it might have been argued that its author was opposed to the dangerous conclusions, which some might be inclined to draw from it. Even now reports are current, that Dr. Temple does greatly disapprove of the *dicta* of some of his fellow-workers. But so long as those reports remain unsubstantiated by any authentic announcement, they must, for all practical and moral purposes, be considered as non-existent; and though the manifesto of independence at the beginning of the volume is amply sufficient for all legal ends, yet we have hardly been able to discover a single person of any school of thought who considers it so availing *in foro conscientiæ*, as to render it possible to abstract from any single one of the Essays the hue which is thrown upon its cast of thought by the conjunction of the remaining six.

We turn to one or two of the apologists for Professor Jowett. A friend of the Greek Professor, whose name seems to be no great secret, has thrown together a set of extracts from Mr. Jowett's writings, under the title of 'Statements of Christian Doctrine and Practice.' Now to whomsoever this pamphlet *may* appeal, it certainly does not seem to us even to touch the comments upon Mr. Jowett's Essay which have appeared in this Review. The grounds of this assertion shall be briefly here set forth.

1. Because the pamphlet seems to imply that Mr. Jowett's

[1] 'I have not read the whole series, nor do I intend to. I judged it right to read 'Dr. Temple's. It seems ingenious; but his leading idea of development of 'his "colossal man" has surely no foundation in experience, nor in Holy Scrip-'ture. If there has been, and is this growth, where are the results? He puts aside 'apparently altogether, the existence and operation of that principle of sin which 'has ever been acting as a disturbing force, and marring God's good work, so far as 'for wise purposes allowed. There is no reference to the work of the Holy Spirit; 'but man's own inward light is enthroned instead of *Him*. Indeed he seems to be 'using all the power which the revelation of the Gospel gives, without acknow-'ledging the source from which he derives it.'

opponents deny the existence of true and beautiful things in his writings. Now *we* have taken pains to express our conviction of his religious instincts: and of the extracts in this pamphlet, some have been referred to by us with praise, some have been actually printed in our critique.

2. Because, even *if* these extracts gave a fair and full image of the Greek Professor's mind and tone, there would still remain the question, why he has lent his countenance to the speculations of such thinkers as Mr. Wilson and Dr. Rowland Williams.

3. Because they do not give anything like a true and complete idea of Mr. Jowett's writings. We are saved the trouble of showing this, inasmuch as the task has been executed with great skill and admirable temper by a writer in the *Guardian*, of March 13th, 1861.

4. Because the presence of beautiful and religious thoughts does in no wise annihilate the evil of the Pyrrhonism with which they are combined. As, in the words of Mr. Kingsley, 'the goodness of the man does not make his doctrine good';[1] so neither does a sound remark in one page annul the unsoundness of that which meets us on the opposite side. Indeed, it is a fair question whether the danger is not rather increased thereby. Many a one who would be utterly repelled by the coldness of Professor Powell, and the scornful arrogance of Dr. Williams, may well be seduced by the modesty, and winning grace, and melancholy earnestness of Professor Jowett.

But another defender, and this time not an anonymous one, has appeared. A late Fellow of Balliol, now the Rector of South Luffenham, declares his belief to be not only with respect to Dr. Temple's Essay, but also in reference to Professor Jowett's, that it is 'far from being sceptical.'[2] There is hardly, we believe, a single ground for a man's claim to be listened to with respect, which is awanting to the writer of these words: not intellectual parentage, not high academical distinction, not services rendered to the Church by members of his family, not a pure loftiness of character which impresses every one brought into contact with it; not courage in speech, nor gentleness in the manner of its utterance. But not all these gifts combined can, we humbly submit, avail to revolutionise the English language or to alter the force of facts. For surely 'sceptical' *is* derived from σκεπτικός; and Doctors Liddell and Scott are right in defining the σκεπτικοί as 'a school of philosophers who doubted all things,' and English lexicographers justified in explaining the word by 'one who doubts of everything.' Now Mr. Jowett's Essay throws a shade of doubt

[1] Inaugural Lecture on Modern History, p. 11.
[2] Letter in the *Guardian* of 13th February, 1861.

on almost everything that it touches; a doubt on the inspiration of Holy Scripture, a doubt on the Mosaic account of the Exodus, a doubt on the possibility of any one being foretold by name, a doubt on the double sense of prophecy, a doubt on the very existence of any true types, a doubt on the reality of future punishment being in store for the wicked, a doubt on the Church's teaching respecting the incarnation of the Son and the personality of the Spirit, a doubt on many topics besides which are referred to in a more incidental manner. The entire composition exhibits, from first to last, a mind which, in the words of a not unfriendly critic in the *Saturday Review*, 'revels in doubts and uncertainties;' and yet we are gravely asked to believe, on the authority of an honoured name, that this Essay has not even reached the confines of σκέψις, but is positively 'FAR *from being sceptical!*'

The 437 inhabitants, whom the census of 1851 assigns to South Luffenham, may perhaps be justified, if they have not read Professor Jowett's Essay, in assuming the correctness of their pastor's opinion. For ourselves, if, after our study of the Essay on 'The Interpretation of Scripture,' we could think of accepting this decision, we should in future resign all thoughts of ever arguing against the famous rule of Loyola, that if the Church 'shall have defined anything to be black, 'which to our eyes appears to be white, we ought in like 'manner to pronounce it to be white.'[1]

The Essay of Professor Jowett has recently received such a lengthened and special comment in this Review, in addition to our general notice of the volume in the October No. of 1860, that we must be content with a brief notice of its reasonings with reference to two dogmas only, namely, the incarnation and the personality of the Holy Spirit.

In July, 1855, we wrote as follows of the Incarnate Lord:— 'The second person of the ever-blessed Trinity, became (though 'in a different way from sinful man) one vast antithesis, if such 'language may be used without irreverence. Creator and yet 'a creature; eternal, yet born in time; pure spirit allied with 'matter; true man, yet without sin; innocent, yet suffering 'punishment; dying, and yet by death the conqueror.'[2] We attempted to show how this stupendous contrast was taught by Holy Scripture in type and prophecy, as well as by the history in the Holy Gospels, and by doctrinal teaching throughout the New Testament; how Christian art, as well as eloquence and

[1] Spiritual Exercises (Seager's Translation), p. 180. London: Dolman, 1847.
[2] Art. Dogmatic Theology, p. 118.

poetry, had tried to realise and express this idea.[1] We alluded to such hymns as our most popular ones for Christmas; and we quoted to the same effect S. Leo, Peter the Venerable, and Manzoni. Let us now so far repeat the process, as to cite two stanzas from a sacred poet of our own communion, less known than he deserves to be; and one short, but noble, passage from Bishop Pearson.

'A child He was and had not learnt to-speak,
Who with His words the world before did make;
His mother's arms Him bore He was so weak,
Who with one hand the vaults of heav'n could shake.
See how small room my infant Lord doth take
Whom all the world is not enough to hold.
Who of His years or of His age hath told?
Never such age so young, never a child so old.

* * * * *

Christ suffers,—and in this, His tears begin;
Suffers for us,—and joy on us bestows;
Suffers to death,—here is His manhood seen;
Suffers to rise,—and hence His Godhead shows:
For man that could not by himself have rose
Out of the grave, doth by the Godhead rise;
And God, that could not die, in manhood dies,
That we in both might live, by that sweet sacrifice.[2]

'That Person which was begotten of the Father before all worlds, and so was really the *Lord of Glory* and most truly *God*, took upon Him the nature of man, and in that nature, being still the same Person which before He was, did suffer. When our Saviour fasted forty days, there was no other person hungry than that Son of God which made the world; when He sat down weary by the well, there was no other person felt that thirst, but He which was eternally begotten of the Father the fountain of the Deity; when He was buffeted and scourged, there was no other person sensible of those pains, than that eternal Word which before all worlds was impassible; when He was crucified and died, there was no other person which gave up the ghost, but the Son of Him, and so of the same nature with Him, *who only hath immortality*.[3]

It argues some very deep difference, some utter want of sympathy with the saints and doctors of the Church, when we find that wonderful contrast, which is the theme of such adoring love and the source of such strains of poetry and eloquence, such wonderful creations of art, alike in music, in painting, and in sculpture, to be simply a ground of difficulty. Yet this, alas! is really the case with the last of the seven Essayists.

For instance, it is a difficulty with Mr. Jowett (p. 355), that if we identify the teaching of the Gospels with that of the Creeds 'we should have to suppose that He [our Lord] was and was not tempted.'

---

[1] See a remarkable criticism on a fresco by Sodoma, in that wild, but most powerful Tale by a consummate master of language—Mr. N. Hawthorne's 'Transformation.'

[2] Giles Fletcher's 'Christ's Victory,' part i. stanza 73, part iii. stanza 5.

[3] 'On the Creed,' Art. iv.

There is precisely the same difficulty, neither more nor less, in believing that He was and was not tempted, as in believing that He did and did not die. Yet only Docetæ, or Ebionites, or Mahometans would deny that he really died as Man; only Socinians would dare to assert that, in His higher nature, He ever for one moment ceased to live. Will Professor Jowett, or any of his friends, give us for once a plain answer to a plain question. Do they believe that Christ our Lord died, as man; and yet continued ever to live as God? If they will tell us that they do not believe this, we shall have gained a clearer conception of their real standing-place. If they do believe it, then the difficulty about the temptation may be simply laid aside, in company with parallel difficulties proposed in the same page of Professor Jowett's Essay.

Yet, as we have alluded to that wondrous scene in the wilderness, let us add a word on one point for fear of being misunderstood. The one feature of difference between our Lord's humanity and ours, namely, his perfect sinlessness, affects the character of His temptation as compared with that undergone by us. It is difficult to state this more clearly and beautifully than has been done by S. Gregory the Great, in a passage cited in the *Catena Aurea* on S. Matthew iv. 1, 2.

'We should know that there are three modes of temptation; 'suggestion, delight, and consent; and we when we are tempted 'commonly fall into delight or consent, because being born of 'the sin of the flesh, we bear with us whence we afford strength 'for the contest; but God who, incarnate in the virgin's 'womb, came into the world without sin, carried within Him 'nothing of a contrary nature. He could then be tempted by 'suggestion; but the delight of sin never gnawed His soul, and 'therefore all that temptation of the devil was without, not 'within Him.'

Mr. Jowett seems to us to write as if he thought that the thorough acceptance of the creeds must close *all* discussion respecting single topics connected with the natures of our Lord. This is far from being the case. The Creeds give us indeed certain canons of judgment respecting the attributes of each nature (a topic handled with his usual dignity by Hooker)[1] but they leave a perfectly fair field of discussion upon others, without the supporters of either view being termed or thought heretical. We may instance the open question, whether our Lord's entry into the room with closed doors is to be considered a property of glorified humanity, as such, or (as Aquinas maintains) only of humanity when conjoined with Deity: or again, whether the term

[1] Eccles. Polity, chap. liii. sec. i.

'quickening spirit' (1 Cor. xv. 45) is, with the Greek Fathers, to be referred to the Third Person of the Holy Trinity, or, with the Latin Fathers, to the human Spirit of the Son. And here we quit this point with the words of Mr. Bright. 'If we really 'believe our Lord to be *God and Man*, then, quite apart from all 'Church formulas, "distinctions" of some sort are inevitable. 'We may object to those of the Athanasian Creed and the 'Fourth Council; but in that case, we must make others of our 'own. Systematic theology did not create the "difficulties" of 'the subject, and to abandon it is not to escape from them. No 'sooner do we call Christ "God and Man," than they confront us 'with "a presence which" in this world "is not to be put by."'[1]

We pass on to the question respecting the personality of the Holy Ghost.

A work of the day on 'Liberty,' quoted with great (we think undue) favour by some of Mr. Jowett's friends, teaches that we ought always in questions of morals, religion, politics, &c. to study our adversary's case. We are not disciples of Mr. John Stuart Mill. The impossibility of carrying out this doctrine, in a world where we so often have to act before we can study, was pointed out in various critiques upon his book, as *e. g.* in the *Guardian* and in this Review. Nevertheless, there is one case to which Mr. Mill's advice does seem to be really applicable, and that is the case where any man attacks a time-honoured belief, more especially in a matter of religion. Mr. Jowett's plan is more antipodal to this than almost any that can be conceived. At the risk of giving offence, we must frankly avow our conviction that, considering the importance of the subject, he does display, upon the point here at issue, a profound and culpable ignorance.

We can only state the merest fragment of the reasoning by which the Church's decision respecting the Third Person of the Holy Trinity is supported.

And first, let it be frankly admitted that the reasoning is by way of inference, and not the simple interpretation of a statement. True; but is an inference from the words of the Bible a light matter? Have we not on record the reproof of One who said, 'Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures' to men who had failed to draw the right deduction from what was spoken by God to Moses at the bush? The Sadducees were condemned because they failed to perceive an inference; an inference of which the force seems to have been gladly recognised by the Scribes and by the multitude.[2]

[1] Note appended to Church History.

[2] See University Sermons, by Dr. Scott (Master of Balliol College)—Sermon on the Pharisee and the Sadducee.

Now we find mention in the Old Testament of an abstraction—the Wisdom of God. The Jews had a suspicion that this Wisdom was not, however, a mere abstraction. A kindred idea prevailed among the heathen. Oriental religions especially, says Mr. Gladstone, had a tendency 'to withdraw the Supreme 'Being from direct relations with the world, and to assign its 'ordinary government to the *Wisdom, more or less imper-* 'sonated.'[1] 'This,' says Dean Milman, 'was the doctrine from 'the Ganges, or even the shores of the Yellow Sea, to the 'Ilissus; it was the fundamental principle of the Indian 'religion and Indian philosophy; it was the basis of Zoroas-'trianism; it was pure Platonism; it was the Platonic Judaism 'of the Alexandrian school.'[2]

And when, then, S. Athanasius and the Arians, amidst their deep differences, agreed upon interpreting that most beautiful passage in Proverbs viii. 22—36 with reference to the Son, remembering how S. Paul had declared that Christ Jesus is made unto Wisdom (1 Cor. i. 21, 24), being in Himself both the Power of God and the Wisdom of God—when, we say, the contending parties agreed in this, they were only proclaiming how God had set his seal upon one of those true traditions, which were indeed 'the wrecks of Paradise.' And herein is acknowledged a great, true, and profound principle, namely, that that which seems at the first glance to be only an abstraction, may prove on examination to be a person. For the Wisdom of God, as had been half imagined by the heathen, and on better grounds suspected by the Jew, is recognised by the Christian in the adorable person of the Son.

There is not a logician, there is not a man of science, who would not immediately concede this further principle; namely, that when a particular instance of a position is once established, the *onus probandi* on behalf of a second instance is unspeakably lessened. If the Wisdom of God is discovered to be a person, so too may what *seems* to be another abstraction, the Spirit of God, prove to be so likewise. But this reasoning, it may be objected, might be urged on behalf of each of the divine attributes. Not so: the Baptismal formula names three persons and three only. Knowing as we do that the Father and the Son are persons, how forced and unnatural is the scepticism which would explain the personality of the Holy Spirit.

---

[1] Homer and the Homeric Age, vol. ii. p. 41.

[2] History of Christianity, vol. i. p. 72 (cit ap. Gladstone in loc.). Horace (though capable of an Arian gloss) has also caught the idea in the words—

'Proximos illi tamen occupavit
Pallas honores.'

This is the merest sample, and no more, of the elaborate proof deducible from Holy Scripture on this head. The Book of Acts and the Epistles are replete with evidence. Yet Professor Jowett (p. 360) evidently maintains that S. John xiv. 26, xvi. 15, are the only texts that can be brought to bear upon it. We believe, on the contrary, that the Church has looked profoundly and justly into the Scriptural, as well as the traditional evidence for a doctrine which the Professor has discussed with the most shallow sciolism. It must require the evidence of a much deeper investigation than this, before she alters her ancient hymn—

> 'The Holy Church throughout all the world doth acknowledge Thee;
> The Father of an infinite Majesty,
> Thine honourable, true, and only Son,
> Also the Holy Ghost the Comforter.'

Once more we lay down this volume—and with what general impression upon our minds? We say *general* impression; for, as a contemporary justly remarks, 'their works are bound up 'together—are sold together—are read together—*and produce a* 'common effect.'[1]

We feel as if we had been studying some of the surviving fragments of Varro. 'And as with reference to these points, 'which I have mentioned by way of example, so too the remain-'ing topics, they involve, rather than explain *(non explicant, sed 'potius implicant)*; as the sway of erring opinion may chance to 'drive them hither and thither, hence and thence do they rush 'forward and back again:' so that Varro himself preferred to doubt on every subject, rather than to assert anything *(ut ipse Varro de omnibus dubitare, quàm aliquid affirmare, maluerit)*.[2]

How different, on the two dogmas just referred to, is the language of Arnold! We are well aware, both from his letters and from a conversation reported by Mr. Francis Newman, that Dr. Arnold held what we should esteem to be neological views respecting many parts of Holy Scripture. His utter want of metaphysical power rendered him unable to appreciate the value of strict terminology in the expression of a sound faith in opposition to heresy. But on the personality of the Spirit and the divinity of the Son how clear and unmistakeable is his language! Let those who doubt this read his sermons for Whit-Sunday, or that on the confession of

---

[1] Once a Week, No. xci. p. 362 (March 23d, 1861).

[2] S. Aug. *De Civitate Dei* (lib. vii. cap. 17, *ad init.*). That the Christian Doctor has not wronged Varro is clear, we think, from the fragments cited, and from Varro's position in Cicero's *Academica*.

S. Thomas, wherein the preacher observes how the fourth Evangelist, in recording the exclamation of the apostle, comes back to the point from which he started—(S. John xx. 28, compared with i. 1.) We can only at present find room for two very brief extracts. 'She [the Church] dreads especially 'that sin of which her Lord has so emphatically warned her—'the sin against the Holy Ghost. She will neither lie against 'Him, by declaring that He is where His fruits are not mani-'fested; nor blaspheme Him, by saying that He is not where His 'fruits are.' 'You have always heard me, and I hope I shall 'always be heard, to insist upon the Divinity of Christ as the 'great point of Christianity.'[1] Vainly, vainly should we seek for declarations such as these, throughout the entire pages of 'Essays and Reviews.' Too true seems to us the suggestion, that a revision of the Prayer-book for the Essayists would involve the change of the words '*I believe*,' into '*I rather think*.'

The Essayists, or at least some of them, appear to imagine that the current of thought in religion, though varying at times, yet sets constantly and steadily in one direction. There cannot be a greater mistake. The influence of the Alexandrian school was checked by that of S. Jerome and S. Augustine; the continental Protestants took different and divergent lines in proportion as they came under the sway of Luther or of Calvin; the nineteenth century is so reactionary against the eighteenth that neither Anglicans nor Roman Catholics, nor Scotch Presbyterians, nor Genevese have much satisfaction in appealing even to those who in their day defended the cause most dear to each. Look, for instance, at the way in which Dean Trench, in his 'Notes on the Miracles,' speaks of the apologists of that age. Or turn, in imagination, to that brilliant, but somewhat narrow and anti-mystic set of men who set on foot the *Edinburgh Review*. Fancy Sir James Stephen appearing before Playfair, Jeffrey, and Sidney Smith, with his articles on Hildebrand, on the Port-Royalists, on Baxter; imagine Mr. John Stuart Mill placing in the hands of the same conclave his critique upon Michelet's 'History of France;' or another critic speaking of the Council of Nice as was done in a recent notice of Prince Albert de Broglie's *L'Eglise et L'Empire Romain*. Yet these are articles that have all really appeared, in company too, with many kindred ones, in the pages of the *Edinburgh* of our own day. How changed from the time when they employed poor Thomas Moore (professedly a Roman Catholic) to write down Mr. Hugh Stuart Boyd and the Fathers of whose works he had translated part! How changed from that still earlier

[1] Preface to Sermons on Christian Life. Life: Letter 125.

generation in which the historian Robertson (himself a Presbyterian minister) told Gibbon that some *ultra* Christians *objected* (!) to the famous fifteenth and sixteenth chapters of the 'Decline and Fall.'

No; let not the Essayist imagine that reaction is a thing unknown. We believe that it will assuredly come, even in the case of a volume that has reached its seventh edition. We believe that the *Times*, though in a not very profound article, was justified both in calling attention to the general phenomenon, and in pointing to the particular illustration of it afforded by Dr. Vaughan's first sermon at Doncaster. Mr. Maurice's paper in *Macmillan's Magazine* for February, 1861, strikes us as an evidence in the same direction. And when reaction falls on 'Essays and Reviews,' we shall watch it, as without sorrow, so assuredly too without surprise.

At a recent meeting at Exeter upon this engrossing subject of the day, it was observed by one speaker, that great error had arisen from neglecting that article in the Creed—the belief in the Holy Catholic Church; by another, that none of the Essayists, in speaking of the interpretation of the Bible, had referred to the value of prayer. Sorry indeed should we be, if either of these allegations could be justly preferred against the pages which the reader is just closing. It is the teaching of the Church Universal, its truth, its wisdom, its necessity, that we have been engaged in upholding; it is the peril to which men expose themselves and others by letting it go, or even throwing doubt upon its correctness, that we have been attempting, however unworthily, to set forth. And with respect to prayer for guidance into the secrets of the Most High, in so far as the knowledge of them is needful for the health of our souls; while much may be found in the canon of Holy Scripture, much in the Prayer-book, much in the pages of Fathers and of the doctors of our Church at home, yet the thought of one of the themes, on which we have touched at the commencement of this paper, brings forcibly to our recollection some aspirations from other sources with which we will now conclude.

The eloquent author of the Book of Wisdom, felt as deeply as any academician of old, as deeply as any thinker like Hume in modern days, the depth of human ignorance alike respecting the world of nature and the world of grace. His yearning for light found its expression in words which, well known as they are, may in part be fitly repeated here. He is speaking, it will be remembered, of his one great theme, namely, Wisdom.

'When I perceived that I could not otherwise obtain her, except God gave her me; and that was a point of wisdom also to know whose gift she was; I prayed unto the Lor[illegible] him, and with my whole heart I said,

O God of my fathers and Lord of mercy, who hath made all things with thy word, . . Give me wisdom, that sitteth by thy throne: and reject me not from among thy children: . . For though a man be never so perfect among the children of men, yet if thy wisdom be not with him, he shall be nothing regarded. . . . O send her out of thy holy heavens, and from the throne of thy glory, that being present she may labour with me, that I may know what is pleasing unto thee. For she knoweth and understandeth all things, and she shall lead me soberly in my doings, and preserve me in her power. . . . For what man is he that can know the counsel of God? or who can think what the will of the Lord is? For the thoughts of mortal men are miserable, and our devices are but uncertain. For the corruptible body presseth down the soul, and the earthly tabernacle weigheth down the mind that museth upon many things. And hardly do we guess aright at things that are upon earth, and with labour do we find the things that are before us; but the things that are in heaven who hath searched out? And thy counsel who hath known, except thou give wisdom, and send thy Holy Spirit from above?'

To that self-same Paraclete, with the meek Robert the Second of France, we pray:

O lux beatissima,
Reple cordis intima
Tuorum fidelium.

Lava quod est sordidum,
Riga quod est aridum,
Sana quod est saucium:

Flecte quod est rigidum,
Fove quod est frigidum,
Rege quod est devium. Amen.

Note on Review of Dr. Wolff's Travels and Adventures.

[See pages 61—85 of the present volume.]

THE second volume of Dr. Wolff's Travels and Adventures was not published until after our review of the first volume had appeared. On reading the second volume, we find that we have, in common with several other Reviewers, fallen into a mistake, or rather, as Dr. Wolff confesses, have been led into a mistake by the writer, which he corrects in the second volume. This mistake we desire to correct, by quoting Dr. Wolff's own words:—

'Mr. Wolff has to correct an error which some of his reviewers have fallen into, though they have spoken very kindly about him; for they have been led into error by an indistinct statement of Wolff himself. They relate that Wolff was sent forth by the London Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews, in the first instance; but this was not exactly the case, for, first of all, the Society wished to send Wolff forth with Solomon (who afterwards disappeared altogether, and never has been seen since) to Poland, instead of sending him to Jerusalem. Wolff protested against this:'

After some discussion,

'Drummond at once said, "To cut the matter short, I will send Wolff to Jerusalem myself, and will pay the expenses." Then he turned to Wolff, and said, "Now, you foolish fellow, you may go to Jerusalem, and cry out just as you said you would do in the midst of the street; and if you commit follies, it is not my fault. I shall lay down neither rules nor orders how you are to act." Wolff then went out entirely under Drummond.'—Vol. ii. pp. 449, 450.

In another part of our review, we ventured to express a doubt that Wolff had effected anything important as a Missionary; we shall again give Dr. Wolff opportunity to speak for himself:—

'Before Wolff proceeds to England, he must be allowed to sum up the results of his expedition to Bokhara, Balk, Cabul, &c. And, first of all, Wolff has obtained, and given to the world, a more clear insight into the state of the Jews from Constantinople to the utmost bounds of Turkey, Persia, Khorassan, and Tartary, than had ever before been given. Secondly, Henry Leeves and others have testified, that several hundred Jews in Constantinople and Adrianople were convinced of the truth of the gospel by Joseph Wolff, and were baptized by the Armenian Christians, and did afterwards confess the name of Jesus Christ, amidst stripes and imprisonments, from which persecutions they were rescued, through the influence of Sir Stratford Canning. Jews in Bokhara, above twenty in number, were also baptized in that place by Wolff himself. Thirdly, he has given a full insight into the state of Muhammedanism, as far as the utmost boundaries of Turkey, Persia, and even to Chinese Tartary. Wolff was

the first to give an insight into the state of the Christian Churches, from Alexandria to Anatolia, Armenia, and Persia. Fourthly, Wolff has given an idea of the creed of the *Ali Ullahi, i.e.* "Believers in the Divinity of Ali," in Persia, such as never was given before. Fifthly, by having circulated the Word of God at Burchund, and among the Pulooj, and by having conversed openly with the Muhammedans, even in the most bigoted towns, yea, in Meshed itself (as was testified by Mirza Baba, the chief physician of Abbas Mirza), Wolff solved the problem, Whether it is possible for a Missionary to preach the gospel in barbarian Muhammedan countries? Sixthly, the Churches of England, and the United States of North America have been incited to follow in Wolff's steps, sending Missionaries to Cashmere and Lahore. Seventhly, the most intellectual Jews of Meshed, who never saw the gospel before, have not only read it through his instrumentality, but since translated it into Hebrew, with Perso-Jewish characters. The celebrated Moollah Yacoob, at Sarakhs, avowed his belief in the Lord Jesus Christ in the midst of the Turcomans: and the pious Joseph of Talkhtoon, in the kingdom of Khiva, with all his followers, became readers of the gospel, at the same time lifting up their eyes to God, asking Him to guide them into truth. Eighthly, all the Jews, everywhere, were astonished and amazed to see one of their nation going about preaching Jesus, as the Messiah and Son of God. And there certainly are hundreds of believers among them who have since confessed the name of Jesus, as Wolff ascertained in his last journey to Bokhara; and his name was remembered, not only among the Jews there, but also by the Turcomans, as he found in the year 1844, when he made his last journey to Bokhara. Ninthly, the Muhammedans in Khorassan and Turkistan, and the Sikhs of the Punjaub, were, by his Missionary labours, convinced that there are Europeans who fear God, which before they could not be persuaded of. Tenthly, Wolff hopes to have proved, by the simple statement of a Brahmin in the Himalaya mountains, situated beyond the reach of British influence, whom he found reading the Gospel of St. Luke, in the Nagree character, with crowds of his disciples around him, that the exertions of the British and Foreign Bible Society are not in vain; and he has also proved that if the Bible Society had not existed, many of the Eastern Churches, the Armenians excepted, would have 'ere long been without a single copy of the Word of God."—Vol. ii. pp. 252—254.

NOTICES.

THE one engrossing controversy of the day has produced heavy and angry drops, which we suppose prelude the pelting storm of discussion. We shall be sorry if the strength of the defence is wasted on desultory affairs of outposts; it would be better, perhaps, to concentrate our forces and economize our materials. The *Quarterly Review*, with a keener eye to business than was displayed by our own publishers, has declined to reprint a careful and comprehensive article on 'Essays and Reviews' which appeared in its January number. 1. Mr. Cazenove, of Cumbrae, as most of our readers are aware, has reprinted from the *Christian Remembrancer* of the last quarter a paper on 'Essays and Reviews,' which, now that it has been authenticated and has passed out of our own immediate responsibility, we may characterise as a paper of remarkable depth and originality. Its title is 'On Certain Characteristics of Holy Scripture' (Mozley), and the reprint is improved by additions and corrections.—2. Dr. M'Caul has reprinted from the *Record*, 'Three Letters on Rationalism and Deistic Infidelity' (Wertheim), of which the most curious part is to be found in an appendix, in the shape of extracts from the Sermons of Dr. Schwarz; a representative of the new spiritual, or high-canting, infidelity, of which Mr. F. Newman has favoured us with some specimens.—3. Dr. Jelf's address delivered in Convocation on moving a synodical condemnation, appears under the title, 'Specific Evidence of Unsoundness in the volume entitled "Essays and Reviews"' (J. H. and J. Parker).—4. Mr. Jenkins, of Lyminge, has successfully carried a single point in the discussion, in his 'Scriptural Interpretation, especially addressed to Mr. Jowett's Essay' (J. H. and J. Parker).—5. While the Bishop of Oxford, in two thoughtful and well considered Sermons, delivered before the University of Oxford, 'The Revelation of God the Probation of Man' (J. H. and J. Parker), has anticipated, to use the old language of moralists, the vice by planting in the contrary virtue.—6. Mr. C. Girdlestone, who seems to have awakened from an hibernation of a quarter of a century, with characteristic ingenuity, which some might stigmatize as wrong-headedness, constructs an 'Argument for Liturgical Revision,' upon the existence of 'Negative Theology' in the 'Essays and Reviews' (Longman). Very few voices have been raised in defence of the beleaguered seven.—7. Professor Stanley is reported to be the author or compiler of 'Statements of Christian Doctrine and Practice, extracted from the published writings of Mr. Jowett' (J. H. and J. Parker). This is the publication to which the Bishop of London alluded, and is or may be taken for at least an instalment of the positive statements which his Lordship is inclined to think ought to satisfy the Church. We must be allowed to remark, argumentatively, that such a line shows an entire *ignoratio elenchi*. All the pious writing in the world cannot make un-said, nor can it contradict, the offensive language of

Mr. Jowett. The Bishop of S. David's has exposed this fallacy completely. But we must say something else. We presume that even Professor Stanley will hardly consider Strauss to be one, the tendency of whose writings is 'to improve the faith of the rising generation.' But yet Strauss could reconcile, and taught and explained how to reconcile, the most destructive criticism and freest speculation with the most touching religious language. These words are his famous conclusion to the 'Life of Jesus:' 'There is a mode of reconciling . . . the consciousness of the theologian and 'that of the Church. In his discourses he [the disciple of Strauss] will 'adhere to the forms and language of the popular conception, but on every 'opportunity he will exhibit their spiritual significance, which to him con-'stitutes their sole worth.' And in a long passage he goes on to instruct the speculative preacher to use all the familiar and religious expressions of evangelical truth, without resting on the slightest 'historical foundation.' We are not saying that Mr. Jowett has adopted the mythical theory; but we see no more proof of any historical belief in the Christianity of the Church in the religious language actually used by Mr. Jowett, than there would be in the edifying pulpit discourses suggested by Dr. Strauss. We could quote very spiritual and searching language from Mr. F. Newman; and the readers of Spinoza will remember that his language is extremely reverent, and in some cases almost pathetic.—8. Mr. R. B. Kennard, who advertises 'Essays and Reviews: a Protest addressed to the Bishop of Salisbury,' &c. (Hardwicke), is, by charging a shilling for it, a simple impostor. The Protest is an impertinent letter, which might be written on a sheet of note-paper; the rest of the shilling's worth consisting of ten extracts from the volume of the Essayists. In the meantime two formal, and grave replies—and these by associated industry—are on the stocks: one series, advertised by Murray, is to be the work of Dr. Thomson, Professor Mansel, Messrs. Cowie, Rawlinson, and others; and Saunders and Otley have undertaken a series of seven connected essays, of which the authors are not yet announced.

'All Saints and its Patron' (Masters), gives an account of the past and present history of a Chapel in S. Peter's Port, Guernsey, and the correspondence which has taken place between the Patron, the Bishop of Winchester, the Rector of S. Peter's Port, who is also Dean of Guernsey, and others, on the nomination of Clergymen to officiate in it; and we regret to say that it presents a dismal instance of episcopal inconsistency, and Puritanism. In one of his letters, the Bishop thought it convenient to establish for the first time a rule that the Patron's nominee should, before being licensed, be approved of by the Rector of the Parish, and be practically subjected to his absolute control—a requirement to which, we may remark in passing, the Rector has not, according to Dr. Phillimore's opinion, which has been taken on the matter, the shadow of a right. (Some persons have stated that this rule has been made with a view to prevent any sound Churchman from being nominated to All Saints' and officiating in S. Peter's Port, but we pass that over.) But this is not all. Will it be believed that the same Bishop, who has established this rule, has for a long time been giving, and is still,

his warmest support and encouragement—not to the Incumbent of a Place of Worship in S. Helier's parish, but to a refractory Curate of S. Helier's Parish Church, who, in defiance of his Rector and of all ecclesiastical law and order, has been in the habit of attending dissenting prayer-meetings, fraternising with heretics and schismatics, endeavouring to throw off completely his Rector's authority, and to constitute himself into a sort of independent Incumbent—a support and encouragement which have resulted in the closing of one of the Chapels of Ease to the Parish Church, and brought about a state of things which had never been witnessed in S. Helier's before? We can well understand why the Bishop of Winchester should feel solicitous, in an unprecedented degree, to vindicate the newly-discovered (real or pretended) authority of the Rector of S. Peter's Port; but surely that is no reason why the inalienable rights of the Rector of S. Helier's should be trampled upon, he himself thwarted, embarrassed, worried, and annoyed, and a rebellious Curate encouraged in his unseemly and mischievous vagaries. If the Incumbent of a Place of Worship, in no way connected with the Parish Church, should be subjected to the absolute control of the Rector of that Parish, surely so should, *à fortiori*, a Curate to his own Rector's legitimate authority. We do not doubt that the Bishop of Winchester feels an instinctive and transcendent desire to maintain the peace and harmony of a Parish, but we must take leave to say that he adopts a very extraordinary mode of showing it, and we must add that his present tortuous policy will never accomplish that end. We do not know whether the Bishop, in the course of his extensive reading, has ever stumbled upon La Fontaine's fable, 'La Chauve-Souris et les deux Belettes;' but the perusal of the correspondence on the subject of All Saints in Guernsey, and what we have heard of the proceedings in connexion with S. Jude's in Jersey, have forcibly brought it to our recollection. It has been frequently stated that the Bishop of Winchester, living, as he does, some hundreds of miles away, and visiting the Channel Islands but seldom,—every three, or four, or even five years, and then in a hurried and perfunctory way,—scarcely ever interferes in the ecclesiastical affairs of those islands without blundering; and the accounts that have reached us of his doings on different occasions tend strongly to confirm the assertion. The Bishop, however, has himself unequivocally acknowledged his inability adequately to superintend that portion of his extensive diocese, and has formally recommended that the Channel Islands should be constituted into a distinct see. We do not think any one will have the hardihood to impugn the justice of the Bishop's estimate of his own efficiency; there are strong grounds for believing that estimate to be perfectly legitimate and correct. It is one of the points on which Dr. Sumner is pre-eminently qualified to speak and to give most discriminating and trustworthy evidence; and the present state of the Church in the Channel Islands affords the most undeniable and melancholy demonstration of the truth of what he so gracefully acknowledges, and gives additional weight to what he has said in regard to their being formed into a separate diocese.

Mrs. Alfred Gatty's writings combine various excellencies seldom united—originality, freshness, power of description, elegance of style

loftiness of aim, and an adaptedness to the capacities of all. This is exemplified in no ordinary degree in her 'Parables from Nature' (Bell and Daldy), of which we are glad to see an illustrated edition, with notes on natural history. Some of the designs, such, for instance, as Holman Hunt's Will o' the Wisp, strike us as very beautiful. We scarcely know of a handsomer and more useful gift-book for any one, old or young, than this sumptuously illustrated edition of the 'Parables.'

We observe with great satisfaction the announcement of a new and cheaper edition of the late Dr. Mill's 'Christian Advocate Publications' (Deighton, Bell & Co.). It has long been a reproach that this complete refutation of the Straussian neology, as applied to the historic criticism of the Gospels, has been inaccessible to the general reader. A cheap English translation of the 'Leben Jesu' is on sale among the infidel books of a well-known publishing firm; but it is only now that its best antidote will be procurable by the public with equal facility. The bearing of Dr. Mill's treatise on the painful controversy lately opened among us is too obvious to be pointed out. Its applicability to the present demand for a satisfactory answer to recent assaults upon the credibility of the Gospel history has doubtless suggested, and (as we hope) will justify, the proposed re-issue of one of the master-pieces of modern theology.

Mr. Bright's important 'Church History' (J. H. and J. Parker), is only announced in this place; because we have an article in hand especially dedicated to its review.

We make the same announcement with respect to Dr. Pusey's edition of the 'Minor Prophets,' of which two parts have been published.

We call especial attention to a most remarkable volume of 'Sermons, chiefly on the Theory of Belief' (Longman), by the late Mr. Boone of Paddington, which on the whole forms a valuable confutation, and that by anticipation, of the principle of 'Essays and Reviews.'

A volume of 'Sermons,' by Dr. Thomson, Provost of Queen's, (Murray), is equal to the preacher's high reputation and to the audience, that of Lincoln's-Inn Chapel, before whom they were delivered.

'The Memoir of Joshua Watson' (J. H. and J. Parker), edited by Archdeacon Churton, is a remarkably interesting work. Interesting to some of us in an especial way, as it gives us a sort of anticipation of personal history, and the way in which events 'in which we have been sharers' will stand with our successors; and doubly interesting as an actual transcript of a remarkably useful life and of a religious character of great depth and refined beauty. Mr. Joshua Watson carries down the series of representative laymen, of which Robert Nelson may be considered the founder. Much trusted with the work and administration of the great Church Societies, he and his predecessor Mr. Stevens, cultivated the highest and sincere graces of the Christian character; and necessarily mixed up with great people and high dignitaries, Mr. Watson possessed the most guileless simplicity and affection in all his dealings with society; and blessed with unusual opportunities for good, he faithfully discharged a noble ministry both in his public and private relations. To those who were admitted to the private intercourses of the Watson and Norris families this memorial of

many happy days of consolation in distress, and of wise counsel in emergencies, will be a sacred treasure; and in the *Christian Remembrancer*, at least, the existence of which is owing to the good brotherhood at Hackney, this Memoir must be met with a double welcome. The volumes are put together in a somewhat desultory form; but on that account they are, to us at least, more acceptable as recalling more of the spirit and manner of life of their subject. We ask for it, what we believe it will find, a prominent place in our Ecclesiastical biography. The cast of religion which it shows is highly creditable to the Church of England; and we trust and believe that the *catena* of English laymen, from Izaak Walton downwards, and in which Joshua Watson occupies no undistinguished place, is not destined to terminate abruptly.

What we have just said of the ministry of laymen leads us by a natural transition to mention two important pamphlets, both published by Ridgeway. Mr. Beresford Hope's 'Speech delivered to the Church Institution,' and Mr. Hubbard's 'Letter to the Electors of Buckingham.' Their subject is identical, and the advice is 'what the clergy may profitably ponder' to take opportunities when they offer. The ground for this advice is a crisis which political persons can better realise than the clergy can.

The Oxford Professors—the Lay Professors, at least,—are not idle. Mr. Goldwin Smith has published two very able Lectures, one on 'The Foundation of the American Colonies,' and one on 'the Study of History, in confutation of Mr. Buckle's Theory'. Mr. Montagu Bernard prints one on 'The Principles of Non-intervention,' which exhibits much political knowledge and thought, and Mr. Neate publishes 'Three Lectures on the Taxation of Land.' All appear with Mr. J. W. Parker's imprint.

A good deal of controversy, and of late in a somewhat embittered tone, has been carried on by Dr. Irons and Mr. Neale, on the repeal of the 29th Canon relating to sponsorship. Our own view is that the Church, if, as we firmly believe it to be, it is a living organisation, has ample right to revise an ecclesiastical law of this sort: and the question therefore is one of prudence and policy. The matter of precedent is, however it may be settled, of less consequence, though historically important.

On the matter of Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister we are inclined to urge very strongly on the clergy the necessity of a combination, as vigorous and decided as that which has been adopted with regard to Church Rates. Vice-Chancellor Wood's able 'Speech' (Rivingtons), delivered at the public meeting last year, has been widely circulated, and Mr. Woolcomb's paper on 'Restrictions in Marriage' (Batty), is at once brief, lucid, and exhaustive.

Motley's 'United Netherlands' (Longmans), is a most valuable work. In picturesque description it nearly rivals Macaulay; and in fairness of view and fulness of materials, it far exceeds that pleasant but superficial historian. The narrative of Leicester in Holland, and the description of England during the Armada days, much as it detracts from the conventional view of Elizabethan statesmanship, has rarely, if ever, been excelled.

The 'Handbook of the Cathedrals of England' (Murray), as far as it has yet gone, embracing seven Cathedrals—Winchester, Salisbury, Exeter, Wells, Chichester, Canterbury, and Rochester, the arrangement is topographical—leaves little or nothing to be desired in the way of archæological and ecclesiological investigation. The two volumes are portable, and intended for the traveller, which of course detracts from their artistic perfection; but they are full and crowded with illustrations, executed with entire correctness and neatness. Appended to the history of the structure in each case is an historical and ecclesiastical *fasti*. The biography of the Bishops is less satisfactory, and we must especially except against the laudatory notice of Hoadley, a person as contemptible as ever sat on an episcopal throne.

'Herbert's Holidays' (Mozley), belongs to a class of books—books for the young—of which the superfluity is equalled by the mediocrity. This is really above the average, and those who want gift books will thank us for mentioning it.

Sir F. Ouseley has every right to preach on 'Choral Worship;' he and Mr. Dykes, the able precentor of Durham, have printed two vigorous and thoughtful Sermons, preached for a local celebration at Derby (Mozley).

'Twenty Sermons preached in S. John's Chapel, Haverstock Hill, by Mr. Baines' (Masters), are a memorial of a connexion which has ceased to exist, but which must have been of no ordinary kind, if we may judge from one fact stated by the author in his preface, that out of a congregation of 200, there were 110 communicants at Easter; and the Sermons are such as might have been expected from the circumstances. Many of them are extremely pointed and telling discourses, and there is a freshness of tone about the whole volume, which will, we hope, insure it a wide circulation.

We have to notice the continuance of the Lent Lectures at All Saints' Church, Bristol. It is creditable to the clergy of the Diocese that they have been able to keep up a daily service and sermon through the whole of Lent, in spite of their Bishop's declining to take any part in them, or to countenance such a mode of observing the holy season. We miss, this year, the names of certain dignitaries who appeared in last year's list of preachers. The attempt which we noticed last year, to bring together preachers of somewhat divergent views, does not appear to have been repeated; but it is clear, from the number of special services that are kept up in Bristol, that the Evangelicals have taken a leaf out of the book of the Church party, and we venture to commend the example of the Bristol clergy to their brethren in other towns.

The 'gentle Johnstones' (Walter Scott tells us) used to *make* history in Annandale, in the somewhat turbulent fashion of the feudal ages in Scotland. We are glad to find a member of the family, Miss A. Hope-Johnstone, engaged in the more peaceful process of *elucidating* history, by means of some very carefully-executed chronological 'Cards' (Edinburgh: Jack. London: Hamilton and Adams). They date from A. D. 1000, and will, we are sure, from their accuracy and moderate price, be a welcome

boon to many, who shrink from the purchase of such expensive works as Talboys's 'Tables,' or Haydn's 'Dictionary of Dates.'

The 'Correspondence between the Bishop of Exeter and Lord Macaulay' (Murray), on the character of Cranmer, and certain points connected with the Reformation, is a vintage which has been retained in the wood for the Horatian period of ripeness. Certainly it has lost neither body, nor flavour, nor colour. We do not remember a better example of the best manner of the Bishop's controversial skill, and the pamphlet is in every way characteristic. Macaulay, polished, lithe, and slippery, and—unsubstantial; the Bishop keen, massive, and with a giant's weight of authority and fact.

It is late to acknowledge, but not too late to be grateful for, the Bishop of Oxford's 'Charge' delivered at the close of last year (J. H. and J. Parker).

'What the Bible says to Servants,' by J. E. V. (Masters), is not what the Bible says to *our* servants. The New Testament spoke to slaves, not to our voluntary 'helps.' But there is, in spite of this fundamental mistake, much good in the tract.

The Rev. Christopher Neville writes a 'Letter to Lord Ebury' (Ridgway), in which he backs his Lordship's proposition to tamper with the Liturgy. His reason is curious: if we do not meet the Dissenters half way, 'all the 'talent, and zeal, and earnestness will be in the ranks of dissent, and 'nothing but interested mediocrity in the Establishment.' Indeed much of this, we are told, has already taken place; from which we conclude that Mr. Christopher Neville has *not* quitted the Establishment. From his conscientious objections to every part of the Church system we should have supposed him to be a good, honest, foul-mouthed, railing Dissenter; but his definition of the Establishment reassures us. That phrase 'interested mediocrity' so exactly suits Mr. Neville, that we are quite sure he is one of us.

'Daily Meditations from ancient Sources' (Masters) is a work edited by Mr. Orby Shipley. It seems to be sound, and though quaint and rugged in style, it shows a Christian temper.

Another work by the same editor, containing Stafford's 'The Female Glory' (Masters), is, as a bibliographical curiosity, to be highly commended. In any other aspect we cannot say so much for it.

One of the ablest pamphlets which we ever read is Mr. M. Sadler's, on 'Doctrinal Revision of the Liturgy' (Bell and Daldy). It is almost a waste of material to spend it on Bishop Baring's strange suggestion of last year.

Captain Crofton's experience in the management of prisons invests his pamphlet on 'Habitual Criminals' (Bell and Daldy) with great authority. We desire to ask for his suggestions, on a subject of which the importance grows daily, that attention which they imperatively demand.

A recent addition to the children's book class of literature (a kind of writing by no means so easy as the uninitiated may suppose), is a little volume, called 'Tales from Greek Mythology,' by Mr. G. W. Cox (Longmans). Whatever tends to promote and popularise classical studies is of no small

importance, especially at the present time, when their inestimable value, as a mental discipline, is in danger of being overlooked through a short-sighted eagerness for more immediate results of knowledge. Mr. Cox's little book is a good introduction to the rich stores of legend and fairy tale to be found in Greek Mythology. The idea of his work, which is much the same as that of Mr. Kingsley's 'Heroes,' or, with a different material, of Charles Lamb's 'Tales from Shakespeare,' is a good one. The stories are well chosen, and gracefully told, in a way intelligible and attractive even to very young readers: much of the indescribable brightness, freshness, and transparent naïveté of Homer and Herodotus is preserved, with a careful omission (for 'maxima debetur pueris reverentia') of the grosser elements which mar their beauty in the original. Here and there the language is *too* condescending; for example, '*great big ship*' (p. 23), and 'great big man' (p. 24). In the introduction and notes (appended separately), Mr. Cox, following in the footsteps of Professor Max Müller and other modern writers on Comparative Mythology, traces back the myths, not to any deliberately didactic intention in their originators, but to the unconscious instincts of those early times. The Myths are regarded as simply the phraseology, most obviously expressive in those days of actual phenomena of men and things; they are the natural product of an age analogous in the life of the world to childhood in the individual; an age highly perceptive and imaginative, but uncritical and inexperienced in causation. This theory few persons will be now disposed to controvert, with the exception, that it does not adequately take into consideration the glimpses of revealed truth, once imparted to mankind, and never altogether lost, though obscured, confused, and distorted by human error. But we have not space to pursue this subject further. We recommend Mr. Cox's 'Tales' as a capital present for children of either sex: protesting by the way against a casual remark of his on Virgil, that the lines on Orpheus and Eurydice 'are the only lines in which he shows true poetic powers.' It is strange that any one with Mr. Cox's love of what is beautiful should appear to slight the exquisite grace and tenderness and pictorial power of the Georgics generally.

A very delightful book indeed is Sir Archibald Edmonstone's 'Short Readings on the Collects' (Masters), not only because it is the faithful offering of one who only desires to tread in the steps of Robert Nelson, and of whose spirit he has deeply drunk, but also, and chiefly, because it admirably reflects the inner mind of the Church. It is spiritual without fanaticism, and deferential to authority without that affectation of sentimental weakness of mind which we sometimes regret to observe in devotional works.

If we have not good preachers it is not for lack of instructors in the art and craft of preaching. Here is a batch of instructors in homiletics, theoretical and practical.—1. 'Thoughts on Preaching,' by Mr. Daniel Moore. This is a valuable work, and Mr. Moore has earned the right to teach, because he himself is a master in his profession. There is, we think, a confusion in all these writers between the apostolic teaching, or proclaiming, or promulging (*κηρύσσειν*), the Gospel, and the modern preaching; the

former need not be by a sermon at all; and, therefore, the words translated in our version, to 'preach the Gospel,' have little or often nothing to do with the modern pulpit. We dislike some of Mr. Moore's phraseology, such as 'a gained attention' and 'a felt void;' and we especially find fault with the practice—a growing one—of the wholesale manufacture of adverbs by adding 'ly' to the past participle, such as 'statedly;' and Mr. Moore is occasionally stilted, as when he describes the 'uncouth vestments,' meaning the 'dirty clothes,' of a London crowd. But his book is the most valuable manual we have on the subject.—2. 'Hints on Preaching' (Hatchard), by Archdeacon Jones, is a good summary of the method adopted by the better class of evangelical preachers.—3. 'Oxford Lectures on Elocution,' by Mr. C. J. Plumtre (J. H. and J. Parker), as the title shows, are confined to the art of speaking, the mere mechanical function, but exhibit much thought and practice. They seem to have been well received on their delivery.—4. 'Sermon Sketches and Essay,' by Dean Close (Hatchard), is a set of skeletons, recalling Mr. Simeon's ponderous work.

The literature of Mr. Stubbs, of Navestock, is well known and appreciated. He has printed for the first time the well-known tract, 'De Inventione Sanctæ Crucis in Monte acuto,' from the British Museum MS. (J. H. and J. Parker), and has prefixed an Introduction, which might almost stand for a political History of England before the Conquest. Mr. Stubbs is as stout a hater of the Norman as Cedric himself.

A second volume, by the brothers Cooper, of the 'Athenæ Cantabrigienses' (Deighton), has appeared. We were never quite certain that the plan of Antony à Wood was the best possible; but on the assumption of its necessity we have little fault to find with the industry and care with which it has been followed in the sister University. Still, as the 'additions and corrections' remind us, a collection of independent biographies of this kind must always be subject to amendment and revision. Some day the Coopers will require a Bliss; just as Bliss, perhaps, already requires another editor. What makes the difficulty of completeness of these works greater is the practice, once so common, of belonging to both Universities. Why not a United University 'Athenæ,' like the United University Club? However, at present the thanks of all literary students are due to the Messrs. Cooper for what they have done; and we have been able to detect scarcely any flaws in their work, though we must admit that it is only when special studies are directed to a particular age or period that such biographies can be tested. There is, however, quite enough on the surface to prove the diligence of the editors, and, what is very important, the impartial and fair spirit in which the book is written. We noticed a slip at p. 520. The Royal Library at the British Museum was the gift of George III. not George II.; and at p. 355 there is a contradiction between 'the latter and former,' a certain Sir Matthew Browne and Sir John Townsend, which we cannot reconcile.

In any Commentary on the Psalter there will be something with which to disagree. There is no book of Holy Scripture in which more of diversity in unity has been permitted. This must be so in all that belongs to the

inner life. Mr. Thrupp's 'Introduction to the Psalms' (Macmillan), gives evidence not only of a well read student in the labours of others, but of a reverent and at the same time independent habit of thought.

We must be pardoned, but we cannot see what 'The Pilgrim, by William Thomas, Clerk of the Council, &c. edited by Mr. J. A. Froude,' (Parker and Bourn,) proves. It is a curious work, because it is contemporary; and in one particular it gives something like new evidence. But for the purpose for which it is published, viz. as an independent testimony to the virtues of Henry VIII., it is ludicrously worthless. Whatever Thomas was, he was not independent. Another false issue is raised by Mr. Froude. He says that Henry VIII.'s reign was not a reign of terror, because everybody acquiesced in it. But the times were times of blood, cruelty, and wrong, not only in England but everywhere else. The common consent in wrong is no disproof of its existence. The truth is that the age was one of detestable wickedness, which it was nobody's particular care to redress. As it was with the prince so with the people. The people loved to have it so. But what Mr. Froude really wants to be proved is that wrong is right, or rather, that there was no wrong in the matter, and that Henry VIII. was the true patriot king, which is quite another thing. The silence or complicity, or even loud applause, of a Clerk of the Council like William Thomas, proves just nothing at all.

Three amusing and lively 'Lectures on Translating Homer,' by the Oxford Poetry Professor, Mr. M. Arnold, have been published by Longmans.

A fourth edition of the 'Life and Works of Madame Swetchine' has just been published by Didier of Paris, in two volumes, under the editorship of M. de Falloux, and deserves a longer notice than we can give it at present. She was a very remarkable woman, and lived on terms of intimacy, and corresponded with, many of the celebrities of the age, such as de Bonald, de Maistre, Louis de Saint-Priest, Madame Récamier, the abbé Desjardins, Auguste Nicolas, de Carné, Donoso Cortès, Albert de Broglie, de Tocqueville, Montalembert, Ravignan, Lacordaire, and her biographer and editor, M. de Falloux, who, in a letter to his friend Montalembert, gives a touching account of Madame Swetchine's last moments. She was born at Moscow in 1782, and died at Fleury, near Fontainebleau, after a lingering and painful illness, in 1857. Besides her life, and a portion of her correspondence, which seems to have been extensive, the volumes before us comprise, among other things, some *Pensées* on various subjects, and an Essay on Old Age, and another on Resignation. Though a foreigner, she seems to have spoken and written French with remarkable correctness and facility.

The friends of the lamented Vinet have been giving to the world an 'Histoire de la Prédication parmi les Réformés de France au dix-septième siècle' (Paris: Meyreuis), originally delivered in the shape of lectures to his pupils by the accomplished Professor in 1841 and 1842. The work consists of a brief sketch of each of the principal preachers that flourished during that century, such as Du Moulin, Le Faucheur, Daillé, Claude, Du Bosc, Superville, Saurin, and several others, with an account of their

writings, and lengthy extracts from their sermons, in illustration of the preacher's special characteristics. The work is not without its value, not only as exhibiting the style of pulpit eloquence prevalent two centuries ago among the French Reformed, but also as showing how the Protestant preachers of that period were, both as regards matter and manner, immeasurably superior to their degenerate descendants—as we cannot but consider them, in spite of the existence of such men as the Monods and Grandpierre,—of the present day. There were some very able men and excellent preachers among them; men who, as well as their immediate predecessors, certainly contributed to raise the tone of preaching, and exercised great influence upon the pulpit oratory of the age; and we believe that some of the great Roman Catholic preachers of the time of Louis XIV. are more indebted to 'Messieurs de la Réforme' than is generally supposed.

Judging from the excitement produced by the publication of the 'Mémoire soumis à l'Empereur Napoléon III sur la Restauration de l'Eglise Gallicane' (Paris: Johanneau), in the ranks of the Ultramontanist party, and the remarks it has elicited, we should, independently of its intrinsic merits, regard it as a very significant and important pamphlet. It is generally attributed to a well-known and very able French Abbé, and it certainly is as vigorous and clever as it is opportune. The author considers the question of the Pope's temporal sovereignty as a thing of the past, and he regards the 'patrimony of S. Peter' as irrecoverably lost; but he proceeds to argue that the loss of all temporal power, so far from jeopardising, as many seem to think, the very existence of the popedom in its spiritual capacity, would, unless something were done to prevent it, instead of removing or diminishing present evils, only serve to perpetuate and aggravate them, by leaving the Papacy more free to act, and affording it fuller scope for those encroachments and usurpations which have been the cause, both politically and religiously, of so much disorder and mischief. 'La papauté,' says he, 'n'en restera pas moins avec ses prétentions à une 'souveraineté spirituelle qui n'est pas plus fondée *en droit* que sa souve- 'raineté temporelle; elle voudra exercer cette souveraineté, et elle cherchera 'à créer pour les Eglises nationales d'innombrables difficultés. On peut 'même croire que la papauté sera d'autant plus excessive dans ses pré- 'tentions spirituelles, qu'elle n'aura plus aucune préoccupation pour son 'temporel. Comme pouvoir politique, la papauté doit ménager les gouverne- 'ments, entretenir avec eux de bonnes relations diplomatiques; elle a prouvé, 'par des actes nombreux, qu'elle savait au besoin sacrifier le spirituel pour 'sauvegarder ou améliorer son temporel. Bientôt elle n'aura plus de telles 'préoccupations. Déjà elle se pose en victime; elle cherche, par tous les 'moyens, à grouper autour d'elle les évêques et les prêtres, les congréga- 'tions religieuses, tous les fidèles qui sont trompés ou qui feignent de l'être 'sur la question des prérogatives papales, et qui semblent croire qu'on ne 'peut être *catholique* sans se soumettre aveuglément à la *souveraineté* 'spirituelle de l'évêque de Rome.' The author then shows how the Pope's extravagant and uncatholic claims are to be met, and advocates the restoration of the ancient Gallican Church. We believe the opinions propounded

in this pamphlet are cherished in secret by a not inconsiderable number of French clergymen, as they certainly have been publicly avowed by several eminent laymen, and that the realisation, at no very distant period, of the measure advocated, in spite of the many difficulties which surround it, is within the range of probability.

If the questions affecting the Pope's temporal sovereignty are not soon practically disposed of, either by its total abolition and extinction, or by circumscription and limitation, it will not be for lack of suggestions and plans for their solution. First of all came, some years ago, Gioberti's project, which has been subsequently improved upon by Professor Giorgini, in his work on the temporal dominion of the Popes, and by the imperial author of 'Le Pape et le Congrès.' Recently we have had other and more trenchant solutions from M. de Laguéronnière and Prince Napoleon respectively. M. de Cavour, on the one hand, and M. de Montalembert, on the other, have each also their solution. Some time back, the Abbé Michon's somewhat adventurous and startling solution of the difficulty consisted in quietly transferring the Bishop of Rome to Jerusalem; but he has now hit upon another plan, which he good-naturedly thinks is open to no serious objection whatever, and will satisfy all the parties concerned. The Abbé and his *projets de solution* remind one of Sièyes and his ready-made constitutions, both of which, too, are remarkable for their 'simplicity.' His present plan, however, as developed in a pamphlet published a short time ago, and which has reached a second edition, 'Projet de Solution de la Question Romaine' (Paris: Dentu), is the following:—

'Ce plan, extrêmement simple, est celui-ci:

'Que la diplomatie européenne, d'accord avec Pie IX. régnant, établisse 'une vice-roi qu'elle reconnaîtra comme le chef temporel responsable du 'gouvernement romain; que l'institution de cette royauté soit placée sous 'le protectorat de l'Europe entière.

'Qu'elle soit complétement indépendante, dans tous ses actes politiques, 'de la papauté spirituelle, comme la papauté sera complétement indépendante d'elle dans tous ses actes religieux.

'Que le vice-roi de Rome soit vis-à-vis des Etats romains et de l'Europe 'comme actuellement le régent de Prusse est vis-à-vis la Prusse, l'Allemagne et l'Europe, qu'il gouverne avec une chambre représentative, qu'il 'ait son armée; sa marine, ses finances, en un mot, tout ce gouvernement 'moderne que demandent impérieusement les Italiens.

'Le pape, alors suzerain de Rome, gardera toute son indépendance 'religieuse protégée par son indépendance politique. Il restera au Vatican. 'Il aura sa cour ecclésiastique. Le vice-roi aura son palais et sa cour 'laïque. Il sera vice-roi à vie; et, à sa mort, son successeur sera nommé, 'comme il l'aura été lui-même, par la diplomatie européenne d'accord avec 'le pontife régnant.

'Quoi de plus simple, de plus réalisable, qui réunisse le mieux les droits 'de la papauté, les droits du peuple de Rome, les intérêts généraux 'de l'Italie?' (Pp. 20, 21.)

The Abbé is an excellent and able man, but very enthusiastic, and somewhat crotchety. Since the publication of his *Projet de Solution*, he has

brought out another work, in which he advocates the convocation of a General Council, and the reform of many disciplinary and other ecclesiastical abuses which have crept into the Roman Catholic Church. It is called, 'De la Rénovation de l'Eglise,' and, as was to be expected, has been placed in the Index.

Of Sermons we have to mention, 1. An unusually good volume by Mr. J. K. Miller, of Walkingham (Rivingtons).—2. 'Earnest Exhortations,' by Mr. Poland (Masters).—3. 'Two Funeral Sermons,' by Mr. Rowe (J. H. and J. Parker).—4. 'Sermons at an Almshouse,' by Mr. Ford, the well-known editor of the Commentary (Masters).—5. 'Sermons, Practical and Doctrinal,' by Bishop Forbes (Masters), which ought to receive a general welcome for their depth and fervour.—6. 'Redemption,' by Mr. Benson (Masters), unusually thoughtful, and written with a connected aim.—And of single Sermons, 7.—a good one, though quaint in style—'The Testimony of Jesus,' by Mr. Colier Adams, preached before the University (J. H. and J. Parker).—8. 'Our Lord's Example,' &c. by Mr. Liddon, an Ordination Sermon (J. H. and J. Parker), of a touching and impressive character.—9. 'The Cause of Church Missions,' by the same preacher (Masters.)—10. 'The Love of Jesus,' by Dr. Pusey, especially addressed to Undergraduates, in his best spirit (J. H. and J. Parker).—11. 'The Christian Hero' [Dr. Croly], a funeral sermon by Mr. Tresham Gregg (Wertheim), perhaps the most absurd and impudent production ever preached.—12. 'A set of Seven Passiontide Sermons,' by Mr. F. G. Lee (Masters), a preacher of great power and vigour.—13. Mr. Russell Woodford's Ordination Sermon, at Banbury, 'The Commission and the Promise' (Masters).—14. 'Christian Progress,' a Trinity College Commemoration Sermon, by Mr. Lightfoot (Macmillan), a discourse which is modelled upon, and not unsuccessfully, and as befitted the occasion, the great rhetorical exercises and formal orations of other days.—15. 'Three Village Sermons on Church and State,' by Archdeacon Thorp (Rivingtons).

We have received the following letter:—

'*To the Editor of the "Christian Remembrancer."*

DEAR SIR,—As you have kindly permitted me to republish, with my name, an article which appeared in your last number, it has become a matter of *personal* responsibility that I should try to remove, so far as I can, any possible misconception of my meaning.

A letter in the *Guardian* of Feb. 20 last, dated Stinchcombe, and signed G. P. contains two suggestions; *one*, that I should 'point out distinctly 'how far, in my opinion, we must recede from the ground taken by our 'great doctors, and how far we are to maintain it;' *another*, that a sentence of mine, in page 220 of your January number (page 59 of the reprint), is calculated, if left unexplained, to do mischief.

1. Now the first of these suggestions seems to me to amount to little

less than a request that I should put forth a *theory of inspiration;* and this, I for one, am not at present, at least, at all prepared to attempt. *Neque conamur tenues grandia;* or, in Scriptural phrase, *neque ambulavi in mirabilibus super me.* (Psalm cxxxi.)

2. But it is surely lawful to maintain that a particular writer (or school of writers) may have over-stated a case, without being prepared to draw the exact line at which they should have stopped. For instance, Lord Lindsay, in his *Progression by Antagonism,* has, I am *inclined* to think, pressed typology to a somewhat undue extent; but I must own, that I should be utterly perplexed if any one asked me to draw the precise line at which such symbolism should end.

All that I meant was this. Although Isaiah and Amos, S. Paul and S. John are all inspired, yet Isaiah does not write like Amos, nor S. Paul like S. John; the individual temperament and training of the respective writers shines out in the marked and unmistakeable manner.

Now, be it said with all deference to the just authority of so great a name, the language of Hooker seems to me (of course I may be quite wrong in my interpretation of it) almost entirely to ignore this patent fact.

His words are: 'So oft as He employed them in this heavenly work 'they neither spake nor wrote any word of their own, but uttered syllable 'by syllable as the Spirit put it into their mouths, *no otherwise than the 'harp or the lute doth give a sound according to the discretion of his hands, that 'holdeth and striketh it with skill*' (Sermon V. § 4). This comparison seems, in my poor judgment, to annihilate the individuality of the writers in a way which is not consistent with facts.

I have not at hand the works of Dr. Horbery, or of Bishop Van Mildert, but my *impression* is, that they both speak in a safer and more guarded manner. It is generally allowed, that the concurrence of those who differ in much, adds weight to testimony. Now, I think that I have with me the author of 'A Plain Commentary on the Gospels,' the Bishop of S. David's, a French Protestant minister, the late M. Adolphe Monod, and Dr. Newman. The first-named of these, Mr. Burgon, quoted Hooker's words, at least eight or nine years since, from the Oxford University Pulpit, but only to express his disagreement. Bishop Thirlwall's sentiments are expressed in his admirable letter to Dr. Rowland Williams, more especially at page 62, where he quotes, and makes his own, the language of M. Adolphe Monod. Dr. Newman writes to the same effect in 'Tracts for the Times,' No. 85, and that he has not, in *this* matter, changed his mind, is shown by his most recent publication, 'Lectures on University Subjects.' For therein, at pages 60, 61, we read: 'Its [Scripture's] human 'instruments, for all that they are inspired and infallible, did not cease to 'be men. S. Paul's Epistles, then, I consider to be literature in as real 'and true sense, *as* personal, *as* rich in reflection and emotion, as Demos-'thenes or Euripides; and without ceasing to be revelations of objective 'truth, they are the expressions of the subjective notwithstanding.' Now I accept this teaching, which seems to me to be precisely identical with that of Dr. Thirlwall and M. Monod: but I cannot even imagine (though this may be my fault) how it can possibly be reconciled with the words of Hooker.

I wrote, indeed, in haste; but my thoughts were not hasty. They had been in my mind for years; and I believe I may truly say, that the pious and learned friends, to whom my reprint is inscribed, are all at one with me.

It would be idle for me to pretend ignorance of the authorship of the letter in the *Guardian*. Not only the importance of the subject of which it treats, but likewise the respect due to its honoured writer, induce me to trouble you with this long letter. Most sincerely do I trust that nothing, in this frank defence of what I have said, is in the slightest degree inconsistent with that respect, which I do indeed most deeply cherish.

It is not uncommon, when praises are dashed with some slight expression of dissent, to quote the well-known lines of the Epicurean poet:—

'Medio de fonte leporum
Surgit amari aliquid, quod in ipsis floribus angat.'

But they are not applicable to the present case. The warning of G. P. has in it nothing that is bitter. It is a kind and charitable act, both to authors and readers, to ask for explanation of anything obscure or seemingly dangerous. On the other hand, his praises, if I may say so, pass the point at which praise is pleasurable. They are almost painful, because they really do seem to me so excessive and so unmerited. If, however (as I must believe from the number of letters I keep receiving), my very insignificant labours have proved a source of instruction and consolation to some fellow Christians, then it is only an act of bare justice that acknowledgment should be made on my part to the *very* numerous advantages enjoyed, *sub Deo*, in the institution whence I date these lines.

I remain, dear SIR,
Yours obediently,
J. G. CAZENOVE.

THE COLLEGE, ISLE OF CUMBRAE,
Monday in Holy Week, 1861.'

INDEX TO VOL. XLI.

(NEW SERIES.)

ARTICLES AND SUBJECTS.

A.

Alexandrinus, Codex [*Novum Testamentum, &c.*], 367—380.

B.

Babylonians, Ancient [see *Tammūz*].
Bennett's Congregational Lectures [*Theology of the Early Church, &c.*], 306—324.

C.

Charity, the Work of [*My Life, &c., Ploughing and Sowing, &c.*], 120—169.
Codex Alexandrinus [see *Alexandrinus*].
Codex Sinaiticus [see *Tischendorf*].
Conybeare and Howson [see *S. Paul*].
Cosmogony, Biblical [*Mosaic Cosmogony, &c.*], 402—423.

D.

Delany, Mrs., and Piozzi, Mrs. [*Autobiography of, &c.*], 325—366.
Dogma [see *Essays and Reviews*].

E.

Essays and Reviews, On Certain Characteristics of Holy Scripture [*The Treasury of Scripture Knowledge, &c.*], 170—223.
Essays and Reviews, Dogma in Relation to Essays and Reviews [*Owen's Introduction, &c.*], 439—487.
Europe and the Papacy [see *Papacy*].

H.

Hessey's Bampton Lectures [*Sunday: Its Origin, &c.*], 86—119.

I.

Industrial Training in National Schools [*Papers read, &c.*], 297—305.

K.

Kingsley [*Why should we pray for fair weather? &c.*], 271—296.

M.

Moberly, Dr. [see *Oxford*].

O.

Oxford University Sermons [*Scott's Sermons, Moberly's Sermons, &c.*], 424—438.

P.

Paul, S., Conybeare and Howson on [*Life and Epistles of S. Paul, &c.*], 1—39.
Papacy and Europe [*Dupanloup on, &c.*], 381—401.
Piozzi, Mrs. [see *Delany, Mrs.*].

S.

Scott, Dr. [see *Oxford*].
Shaftesbury, the first Earl of [*Memoirs, Letters, and Speeches of Anthony Ashley Cooper, &c.*], 40—60.

T.

Tammūz, on the Worship of [*Ueber Tammūz, &c.*], 253—270.
Tischendorf's latest Discoveries [*Notitia Codicis Sinaitici, &c.*], 224—244.

W.

Wolff, Dr. [*Travels and Adventures of, &c.*], 61—85.
Note on Wolff's Travels, &c. 488, 489.

SHORTER NOTICES OF BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS.

JANUARY—Lyra Germanica—Butterflies—British Sea Weeds—Churchman's Almanack—Churchman's Companion—Secretan's Life of Robert Nelson—Dr. Pusey on the Minor Prophets—Denton's Commentary—Delamotte's Primer of Illumination—Professor Blunt's Essays—Flower's Translation of Apology of Theophilus—Olshausen on the Gospels—Letter to the Rev. Rowland Williams, by the Bishop of S. David's—Miss Yonge's Hopes and Fears—M. Réville's Lettres sur l'Eglise Anglicane—Abbé Lacordaire's Sainte Marie-Madeleine—Abbé Guettée's Histoire des Jésuites—La Papauté en présence de l'Evangile et de l'Histoire—M. de Fresne's Divinité du Christianisme—M. Emile de Bonnechose's Jean Hus, Gerson et le Concile de Constance—Tudor on the Decalogue—The Workhouse Orphan—West's Sermons, &c.

APRIL—Cazenove on 'Essays and Reviews'—Dr. M'Caul's Three Letters on Rationalism and Deistic Infidelity—Dr. Jelf's Address on 'Essays and Reviews'—Jenkins' Scriptural Interpretation—The Bishop of Oxford's Sermons—Girdlestone's Argument for Liturgical Revision—Statements of Christian Doctrine and Practice, extracted from the published writings of Mr. Jowett—Kennard's Protest addressed to Bishop of Salisbury—All Saints and its Patron—Mrs. Alfred Gatty's Parables from Nature—Dr. Mill's Christian Advocate Publications—Bright's Church History—Dr. Pusey's Minor Prophets—Boone's Sermons—Dr. Thomson's Sermons—Memoir of Joshua Watson—Beresford Hope's Speech—Hubbard's Letter—Goldwin Smith's Lectures—Bernard's Lecture—Neale's Three Lectures—Irons and Neale on the Repeal of the 29th Canon—Vice-Chancellor Wood's Speech on Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister—Woolcomb's Restrictions in Marriage—Motley's United Netherlands—Handbook of the Cathedrals of England—Herbert's Holidays—Sir F. Ouseley's and Mr. Dyke's Sermons on Choral Worship—Baines' Twenty Sermons—Lent Lectures at All Saints' Church, Bristol—Miss Johnstone's Chronological Cards—Correspondence between the Bishop of Exeter and Lord Macaulay—The Bishop of Oxford's Charge—What the Bible says to Servants—Neville's Letter to Lord Ebury—Daily Meditations—Stafford's The Female Glory—Sadler's Doctrinal Revision of the Liturgy—Captain Crofton's Habitual Criminals—Cox's Tales from Greek Mythology—Sir A. Edmonstone's Short Readings on the Collects—Moore's Thoughts on Preaching—Jones' Hints on Preaching—Plumtre's Lectures on Elocution—Close's Sermon Sketches—Stubbs' De Inventione Sanctæ Crucis in Monte Acuto—Cooper's Athenæ Cantabrigienses—Thrupp's Introduction to the Psalms—Froude's The Pilgrim, by William Thomas—Arnold's Lectures on Translating Homer—Life and Works of Madame Swetchine—Vinet's Histoire, &c. &c.

R. CLAY, SON, AND TAYLOR, PRINTERS, BREAD STREET HILL.